

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Perse School House, Cambridge.
A. D. GODLEY, D.Litt., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., Hon. Treasurer. Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A., Chairman.
Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., Hon. Secretary.
Prof. GILBERT MURRAY, LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.R.S.L. With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.
CYRIL BAILEY, M.A., Representing the Oxford Philological Society.
Prof. SIR WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.B.A., Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Principal Sir W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., McGill University, Montreal; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., University of Melbourne.

33
Vol. XXXIV

MAY-JUNE, 1919

Nos. 3, 4

CONTENTS

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:

	PAGE
Graeco-Roman Ostraca from Dakka, Nubia. HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE	49
On the Date of the <i>Herakles</i> of Euripides. J. A. SPRANGER	54
Additions to the Greek Anthology. J. U. POWELL	55
<i>Nihil in Ovid.</i> A. E. HOUSMAN	56
Phaedrus and Quintilian I. 9, 2.—A Reply to Professor Postgate. F. H. COLSON ..	59
Virgil, <i>Aeneid</i> 6. 859. H. E. BUTLER ..	61

NOTES:

Thucydides II. 48. ARTHUR PLATT ..	63
Emendation of Theophrastus, <i>Characters</i> . H. G. VILJOEN	63
The Reading in Aristophanes, <i>Ach.</i> 912. M. KEAN	63
Euripides, <i>Hecuba</i> , 854-6. J. M. SING ..	64
Horace, <i>Sat.</i> I. ix. 39-40. M. KEAN ..	64
Queries to Article on Plaut. <i>Stich.</i> I ff. <i>Class. Rev.</i> , September, 1918. E. J. BROOKS	64
Augustus. F. HAVERFIELD	65
Mandalus. Recula. Malacrucia. W. M. LINDSAY	66
Note on Cicero, <i>Pro. Rab. Post.</i> 7. 17. E. G. HARDY	66

NOTES—continued:

	PAGE
Note on Virgil, <i>Eclogue</i> IV. 60 ff. W. WARDE FOWLER	67
'Mule nihil sentis' (Catullus, 88, 3). H. W. GAPROD	67
Virgil, <i>Aen.</i> XII. 473, 519. J. S.	68
Pompey's Compromise: Cicero, <i>Ad Fam.</i> VIII. 11, 3. TENNEY FRANK	68

REVIEWS:

Miss Matthaei on Tragedy. J. T. SHEPPARD	69
Plutarch's Lives. G. W. BUTTERWORTH ..	71
Euthymides and his Fellows. W. LAMB ..	73
A History of Greek Economic Thought. A. C. PEARSON	74
Gaetano de Sanctis: <i>Storia dei Romani</i> . ADELA MARION ADAM	75
Catalogue of Arretine Pottery in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. W. LAMB	78
The Descent of Manuscripts. C. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS	79

NOTES AND NEWS 84

Bolshevism. T. C. WEATHERHEAD 84

BOOKS RECEIVED 84

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
BOSTON, MASS.: GINN & COMPANY, 15, ASHBURTON PLACE.

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. net; U.S.A., 30 cents net. Yearly Subscription (Eight Numbers), 7s. 6d., Post Free. U.S.A., \$2.00 net.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free), provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public, viz. 7s. 6d. for the *Classical Review*, 12s. 6d. for the *Classical Quarterly*, or 18s. for the two Journals jointly, post free in each case.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. E. Norman Gardiner, 2, The College, Epsom.

BOOKS FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

104, CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C. 2.

PATRIOTIC POETRY GREEK AND ENGLISH

AN ADDRESS WRITTEN FOR THE 500TH
ANNIVERSARY OF AGINCOURT. WITH
NOTES AND REFERENCES AND FOUR
ILLUSTRATIONS

BY W. RHYS ROBERTS

LITT.D., HON. LL.D., PROFESSOR OF CLASSICS IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

3s. 6d. net

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

TEACHERS REGISTRATION COUNCIL

Representative of the Teaching Profession

(Constituted by Order in Council, 29 February, 1912).

In accordance with the above-mentioned Order,

A REGISTER OF TEACHERS

is now maintained by the Council.

The Official List of Registered Teachers is intended to include teachers of all types who have fulfilled the conditions laid down by the Council. In the case of University Teachers the sole condition is evidence of 3 years' experience. In all other cases evidence of 5 years' experience is required, this period being reduced to 3 years where applicants produce satisfactory evidence of attainments and of professional training in teaching.

For Information apply to THE SECRETARY, TEACHERS REGISTRATION COUNCIL,

47, BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C. 1.

ual
5s.
ings
(ee).
the
the
t in
6d.
the
on.

Y

RS

C. 1.

The Classical Review

MAY—JUNE, 1919

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

GRAECO-ROMAN OSTRACA FROM DAKKA, NUBIA.

IN 1909 the ancient cemeteries in the neighbourhood of Dakka, the Graeco-Roman Pselcis, were explored by Mr. C. M. Firth and his colleagues of the Archaeological Survey of Nubia.¹ Apart from the Egyptian and indigenous remains discovered, these excavations produced results which may be of some interest to students of Roman military affairs. In the first place a considerable part of the wall of the Roman fortress at Pselcis was cleared. As Mr. Firth reports, 'the wall of the Roman camp [fortress] which protected the temple [of Dakka] on its south and west sides was cleared, and the south and west gates opened. These latter were protected by bastions, in the lower stories of which were rooms. . . . The legionary corn-mill (?) and part of a military inscription were recovered from the south gate.' A proof (for which I have to thank Mr. Firth) of the plan of the fortified enclosure shows, however, that the southern gate-house was flanked by solid bastions, with a semicircular projection beyond the face of the curtain-wall. The western gate is much better preserved, and shows a small guard-chamber in each of the flanking bastions, with an entrance giving upon the interior of the fortress and not upon the gate-passage. In this case, however, the projecting semicircular bastions have been converted by the later addition of a heavy external casing into rectangular towers.

¹ See the *Bulletin of the Archaeological Survey of Nubia*, No. 5 (Cairo, 1910), pp. 7 f. I do not know whether Mr. Firth's definite report has yet been published.

NO. CCLXXIII. VOL. XXXIII.

The fragmentary inscription mentioned by Mr. Firth reads as follows:

. . . LIV [. . .
SVB ♂ ♀ [VR . . .
Q ♂ RAMM [. . .
MIL A LEG ♂ III [. . .
ET • COH [. . .

The legion referred to can hardly be other than that known as *Cyrenaica*, which was transferred after long service in Egypt to Bostra under Trajan.²

Nearer the Nile, and some 500 metres north of the Temple of Dakka, Mr. Firth was led by the character of the brick-work to examine a small mud-brick building which Muslim piety had transformed into a sheikh's tomb. When cleared, this structure proved to be a two-roomed building 'with a staircase leading to a small upper platform.' To the west, 'was a huge mass of Roman pottery. . . . There were two hundred or more amphorae, both broken and unbroken, together with pots and jars of other shapes, and a number of bowls of fine blue-glaze. It is possible that the small building represents a customs-house or store at which cargoes were disembarked.' From this structure and from the neighbourhood of the temple about 300 Greek ostraca were recovered.

The nature of the ostraca found suggests that the building was rather the office, and presumably store-house of an official charged with the issues of certain supplies to the troops at Pselcis. Nearly all the fragments which Mr.

² Cp. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History* (Ser. I.), p. 225.

Firth handed over to me for publication are receipts or 'chits' handed in by soldiers in return for wine issued to them. Many are so small as to show no more than a few syllables of the stereotyped formula, and therefore not worth printing; the remainder are here reproduced by way of supplement to the ostraca found at Pselcis by Gau in 1819,¹ and edited first by Niebuhr,² then by Franz,³ and more recently by Wilcken.⁴

I should express my very deep indebtedness to Professor B. P. Grenfell who deciphered one badly worn but important piece (No. 2), reread several others, and aided my inexperience by supplying a number of references. Sir Frederic Kenyon also was good enough to check my copy of No. 1.

The present series contains only two non-military pieces. The first of these (No. 1) is unfortunately incomplete, but is important as recording a *sitologos* of Pselcis (?) and the upper toparchy of the Dodekaschoinos—a region hitherto regarded as not organised on civil lines as a nome.⁵ The second (No. 2) is a list of payments of *κολλόροβοι*—i.e., 'gum-plants,' which is at least interesting as containing a word unknown to lexicographers.⁶

All the remaining examples are military receipts. These, with two exceptions (Nos. 16, 19), are epistolary like the receipts of the earlier series found by Gau; but whereas Gau's ostraca are addressed to an *optio* and relate almost entirely to dry rations (corn), Mr. Firth's examples introduce another, and hitherto almost unknown, official, the *cibariator*, and acknowledge

the issue of wine or its equivalent. The bare formula used in these documents is as follows: 'A, soldier (or trooper) in the century (or squadron) of B, to C, the *cibariator*, greeting. I received from you out of the *cibarium* x (quantity) of wine, value y denarii, z obols. Year a, month β.' Except in certain necessary cases (see below) this formula is only twice varied *ὁμολογῶ εἰληφέναι* (No. 3), and *ἔσχον* (No. 4) being substituted for the normal *ἔλαβον*.

The soldiers who wrote these receipts seem to have been mostly Graeco-Egyptian and Hellenistic, names like Besarion (No. 7), Dioscoros (No. 4), Nilos (No. 6), Ammonios (No. 9) being the most usual; in some instances a Roman name is prefixed (Nos. 6, 7, 8). Naturally most of the writers are privates (*στρατιώτης*) or troopers (*ἵππεύς*); but other ranks are sometimes mentioned, such as a *custos armorum*,⁷ in No. 8, a *tesserarius* in No. 6, a *signifer* in No. 9, an *optio*⁸ in Nos. 10, 11, a *dromadarius*⁹ also twice occurs (Nos. 12, 13).

Unfortunately the names of the units stationed at Pselcis are never mentioned in the ostraca, individuals being identified merely by the century (usually abbreviated x; once ζ, occasionally in full *κεντουρία*) or the turma (always symbolized by τ) to which they belonged; the officer's name being always added. Officers appear to have been sometimes of western origin—if the names Sabinus (Nos. 5, 11, etc.), Antonius (No. 7), Longinus (Nos. 12, 13), are any guide—and sometimes Hellenistic or Graeco-Egyptian—e.g., Glycon (Nos. 13, 17), Hermeinos (No. 14), Alexander (No. 8).

The official addressed was styled *κιβαριάτωρ*, a title representing a Latin *cibariator*; neither form is to be found

¹ *Neu entdeckte Denkmäler von Nubien*, pls. viii., ix.

² *Ap. Gau op. cit.* pp. 18-20.

³ *C. I. G.*, III. 5109, 1-37.

⁴ *Griechische Ostraka* II., Nos. 1128-1146. Wilcken's conjecture that 1265 came from Dakkeh seems to be confirmed by the re-appearance of Petronius the *cibariator* in the present series.

⁵ Milne, *Hist. of Egypt under Rom. Rule*, p. 23.

⁶ What is meant by τὸ κολλόροβον which Sagittarius holds in his right hand (Hipparchus, *ad Phaen.* I. 16 *ap.* Migne, *P. G.* XIX. 1037 A) is not clear: Sophocles doubtfully suggests 'club.'

⁷ Cp. Bates, *Rock Inscr. near Dakka* (in *Bull. of the Arch. Survey of Nubia*, No. 5), Station 1, Nos. 6-7 *Ἀνρηλῖς* | *Ερμεινία* | *νός* | *ἀρμυρο* | *κουστόρ* *στὰ* | *τῶναρις*. Also *P. Hamb.* 39. p. 175; *B. G. U.* 344, 14; and Lesquier, *L'Armée Romaine*, p. 229, and App. I., *Inscr.* 13 (= Maspero, *Ann. du Service des Ant.* IX. 267 ff.).

⁸ Cp. Wilcken's Nos. 1130 ff.

⁹ Cp. *Eph. Epigr.* VII. 463; *P. Oxyr.* 1652 (unpublished); *B.G.U.* 696, 14, 30, and 827 verso.

in the Lexica.¹ In the present series there is a good deal of variance as to the orthography of the Greek form, which is spelt (in the dative) *κιβαριατορι* (No. 6), *κιβαριατωρι* (No. 9), *κειβαριατωρι* (No. 8), *κιβαρειατορι* (No. 7), and once *κι]βαριατων[ι*. The second *ι* is represented in all examples save one (No. 5), and Wilcken² therefore appears to be mistaken in judging that *κιβαράτωρ*—*cibarator* are the true forms. Similarly the department administered by this official is variously rendered (in the genitive) *κιβαριον*, *κιβαρειον*, and *κειβαριον*, reproducing the Latin *cibarium*. The function of the *cibariator* was to issue wine (or money for the purchase of wine, see below) to troops from whose pay the price was deducted.³ In No. 10 he is distinguished from the *optio*, who was responsible for 'dry rations.' Yet from No. 14 it appears that he also dispensed salt, lentils and vinegar—the last named article being also mentioned in No. 16.

The amount of wine issued is determined (a) by its value alone (see Nos. 4, 9), or by the vessels in which it was contained, the value being added in this case also. Two such vessels—obviously of standard capacity—are mentioned: (1) The *τρικέραμον*⁴ (abbreviated *τρικ*, see Nos. 15, 19), always a neuter noun (Nos. 10, 11), seems to be otherwise unknown; for the form *cp. τρίχυρον*, *τριμάτιον*, *τριχόινικος*. As the *διπλοκέραμος*⁵ was equivalent to two *κέραμοι* or *κεράμια*, so the *τρικέραμον* had the capacity of three *κέραμοι*. Its value seems to have fluctuated; in No. 10 it is worth 3 denarii and 20 obols, while in No. 13 two *τρικ.* are valued at 5 denarii and 9 obols. (2) The *κολοφώνιον* (abbreviated *κολ*, see Nos. 7,

16) again had a definite capacity, as Wilcken⁶ after some hesitation recognises. Once more the value is uncertain; in No. 5 two *κολοφώνια* are worth 4 denarii and 15 obols, in No. 7 one *κολοφώνιον* is priced at 3 denarii, in No. 8 at 2 denarii and 2 drachmæ, in No. 17 at 3 denarii and 6 obols.

In some instances (Nos. 14, 18, 20⁷) the receipt is not for wine, but for a sum of money paid over by the *cibariator* to soldiers to purchase their own supplies; in others (Nos. 6, 6^a, 11, 22) the issue is in kind, but the price is left undetermined 'until the value is fixed.'

Where the recipient was illiterate, his receipt could be written for him by a comrade, who usually added his own name and the unit to which he belonged (No. 7 is exceptional), sometimes stating that the author of the receipt 'did not know letters' (Nos. 8, 21).

The receipt ordinarily closes with the date, in terms of the regnal year (*L=ἔτους*) of the ruling Emperor,⁸ followed by the day of the (Egyptian) month.

Certain subscriptions often follow the main text, such as the formulæ *συνεδοκῶ* (No. 23⁹), *σέσημειῶμαι* (Nos. 4, 21¹⁰), the countersignature *διὰ . . .*¹¹ (Nos. 17, 19, 20); the directions *τοῖς λιβραρίοις* (No. 18), *τοῖς κουράτορι* (Nos. 15, 19?). Finally the amount of wine issued, or the value, are frequently summarised below, no doubt to facilitate reference (Nos. 16, 18-21).

I. Πετεσις Πελλίου σιτολογος [Ψε-
κεως?
και ανω τοπου της ιβ σχοιουν [δια . . .

¹ The word has not previously occurred except in Wilcken's Nos. 1142, 1265.

² *Ib.*

³ Rations were issued to troops; but unlike the modern rations their value was deducted from the soldiers' pay. John the Baptist (St. Luke iii. 14) may therefore have had reason to advise the soldiers to be content with their rations (*ἀρκείσθε τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ὑμῶν*).

⁴ In Wilcken's No. 1129, l. 4, *τρικέραμον κοπτικόν* is probably to be read. Presumably it was a vessel of standard shape and size manufactured at Coptos (the modern Kift, some distance north of Luxor).

⁵ See Wilcken, I., p. 759.

⁶ I., p. 764; cp. No. 1265 (in No. 1166 *κολ* perhaps = *κολοφώνιον*). No doubt the term originally denoted a peculiar type of wine vessel exported from Colophon; but this restricted sense is quite absent in this ostraca. An exact analogy is provided by the term *κνίδιον οἴνου* in an anecdote concerning the Egyptian monk Sisoës (see *Apophth. Patr.*: Sisoës VIII.): cp. Wilcken I. 765.

⁷ Cp. Wilcken, Nos. 1142, 1265.

⁸ The persons named in this and the earlier Dakka series are often the same. Presumably therefore Wilcken's dating (l. 705) for the earlier series applies equally to the later.

⁹ See Wilcken, I., p. 83: *B.G.U.*, 834, 24.

¹⁰ See Wilcken, I., p. 83, Nos. 1131, 1132.

¹¹ For the significance of this, see Wilcken, I. 128.

νυχου Πετεφίλου <ε>γχιδοντος [τινα
μερη?

της σιτολογίας εμετρησεν Ουχαι[ς
νουφισυ υ(περ) ονοματος Ψενπαν[
τιαπι<ο>ς υ(περ?) Μετακωλυσεως[
ιε L κα[]χ .[

2 τόπου = τοπαρχίας.

3 = εγχειρίζοντος.

5 νουφισυ (sic).

6 Μετακωλυσεως (sic): Grenfell suggests a place-name.

2. Απολλως Απολλωτος και α-
δελφος κολλοροβοι ε
Αρεωτης αλιευσ υπερ ναν-
λου κολλοροβον α
Τοχαμανις Πετερμουθου
και Τανουβις Αθασιδος
κολλοροβοι ε
Παμις Απολλωτος κολλοροβοι γ
Πασεφους Ασκλατος κολλο-
ροβοι γ.

A list of payments of κολλοροβοι (otherwise unknown) or 'gum-plants.'

3. [. . .] επτι α[δης? στρα-]
[τιω] της x Ποσ[ειδω-]
νιου κιβαρει [ατορι]
χαιρειν· ωμολογ[ω ειλη-]
φηναι παρασου ε[κ του]
[κιβ]αρειου οινου [. . .]
[] υν[. . .]

2 x = κεντουρίας.

4. Διοσκορος Δ[
Πετρωνιω [χαιρειν·]
εσχον παρα σου απο]
τιμης οινου δηναρι-
α δυο L ιη
[] ιβ
εσημοσομην

7 See Wilcken, I. 83, and cp. No. 21 (below).

5. Ιουλιος Γερμανος στρατιω(της)
x Σαβεινος Πετρωνιω κιβαρατορι
χαιρειν· ελαβον παρα σ(ου)οινου
κολοφονια δυο δηναριων
τεσσαρων οβ(ολων) ιε L x δ οβ. ιε
L ιξ // Επαγωμενω(ν) δ Πασιον.

2 κιβαρατορι (sic): cp. Wilcken, No. 1265.

5 L = γίγνεται, 'total.' x = δηναρίων.

6. Ιουλις Νιλος ιππ[ευσ]
x Λονγινω Αλε[ξανδρω]
κιβαριατορι χαι[ρειν· ελαβον]
παρασου οινου κ[ολοφωνιον εως]
συντιμθη β.[. . .]
τεσσαρριο[ς εγραψα υπερ αυτου]

6a. . . .]ης ιππευς x Γεμελλου
κ[ι]βαριατωρι χαιρειν
ελαβον πα[ρα] σου εκ του κιβα-
ριου οινου] κολοφωνιν εν εως συ[ν-
τιμθη] L ιη // Φασωφι κ
]εγραψα

7. δρασα ε
λεων Βησαριων
ιππευς x Αντωνι(ου)
Πετρωνιω κιβαριατορι
χαιρειν· ελαβον παρα σου εκ του
κιβαρειου οιν' κολ εν x γ
L ιξ // Μεχειρ ια
Πρισκος Αμμο-
νιανος εγρα-
ψα.

6 = οιν(ου) κολ(οφωνιον) εν (δηναριων) (τριων).

8. M Αυρηλις Ασκληπιαδης Ερμιν . .
x Αλεξανδρου Πετρωνιου (sic) κειβα-
ριατωρι
χαιρειν· ελαβον παρα σου οινου
κολοφονιν
εν δηναριων δυο δραχμας δυο Μαρκ
[ος?]
Αυρηλιος Ωριων Σαραπιων αρμωρω
(ν)
κουστωρ εγραψα υ(περ) αυτου μη
ιδωτος
γραμματα L κ // Μεσορη ιβ

9. Αμμωνις Αμμωνις σημε-
αφορος Αλεξανδρω κιβαρια-
τωρι χαιρειν· ελαβον εκ του
κιβαριου οινου δηναρια
οκτω οβολ(ων) οκτω x η οβολ η
Ερμειν [.] Αντιοχου
. . . εγαψ[α] L ιη Παοινι ιδ

10. Νεφερωσ Νεφερωτος
οπτιων Αλεξανδρω κει-
βαριατορι χαιρειν· ελαβον
παρα σου οινου τρικεραμον
εν x τριων οβολων εικοσι
L ιη // Φαμενωθ κ.

11. []διανος x Σαβινου
[. . .]κιβαριατ[ορι] χαιρειν· ελαβον
[παρα σου οινου τρι]κεραμον εν αχρι
συν-

[] L ιξ // Φαμενωθ ια
[] . εινευσ οπτιων εγραψα

3 αχρι συν-[αρσεως? (cp. Wilcken, No. 1135,
5. αχρι λογου συναρσεως).

12. Ἀντωνίς Ἰέραξ δρομαδάρ(ιος) ≠ [Λον-
γεινόν]
Πετρώνιω κιβάριατορι χαιρέιν·
ἐλάβον]
παρα σου ἐκ του κιβάριου[]
καὶ τρικαιραμον ἐν δηναρίων τριών?
οκτώ οβολῶν
.. [
13. Ἀντωνίος Ἰέραξ δρομ[αδάρ(ιος)]
≠ Λονγεινόν Πετρώνιω κιβάρια-
τορι]
χαιρεῖν· ἐλάβον παρα [σου ἐκ του]
κιβάριου οἶνον τρικερα[μα β (?)]
δηνά-]
ρίων πεντε οβολ(ών) θ []
νιδῆς στρα(τιωτῆς) $\frac{x}{p}$ Γλυκ[ωνος
εγραψα]
14. Πρίσκος Πανῶλος ἱππεύς
≠ Ἑρμείνου Ἀπολλοῦ κει-
βάριατορι χαιρεῖν· ἐλάβον
παρα σου ἀπο τιμῆς φακού
καὶ ἀλός καὶ ὀξέος δηναρί-
α τέσσερα οβολοὶ
οκτώ L γ ≠ Τυβί γ
γρα (sic)
15. $\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\psi\alpha$ ἰδία χίρι
δι Ἑρμίνος Τυράνος
κουρά τρι^x ᾱ
κουρά τρι^x ᾱ
3-4 = κουράτορι (curatoribus) τρικεραμον εν.
16. Πετρώνις χιρίστη-
ς κο^α ᾱ ὀξιδίν
α
2 ὀξιδί < ο > ν, a jar of vinegar.
17. [. . .] δοντῆς στρατιωτῆς [$\frac{x}{p}$]
Γλυκῶνος Πετρώνιω τῷ
κιβάριατορι χαιρεῖν· ἐλάβον
παρα σου ἐκ του κιβάριου οἶνον
κολοφώνιον ἐν δηναρίων
τριών οβολ(ών) $\frac{x}{p}$ αὐτός [εγραψα]
L ια ≠ Επειφ
δι Ερμ[εῖνου?]
18. Διδυμός Παχωμίου?
Ἀλεξάνδρῳ κιβάρια[τορι χαιρεῖν·
ἐλάβον]
[παρα] σου ἀπο τιμῆς οἶν[ου δηναρία
δ (?)]
- L ιη ≠ Τυβί ἰ εγραψα ἰδία χεῖρι?
τοῖς λιβρariois
θ δ
5 Second hand.
6 = δηναρίων? τέσσαρων (third hand),
19. Ποσίτος κοινῶδες
τοῖς L^{ov} τρι^x α
δια Πισαν (second hand)
α
2 Perhaps = τοῖς κουράτορι: cp. No. 15.
20. Ἑρμείνος θ [. . .] στρατιωτῆς]
 $\frac{x}{p}$ Τρουνηίου [. . .] κιβάρια-]
τορι χαιρεῖν· ἐλάβον παρα]
σου ὑπ(ερ) τιμῆς οἶνον δηνά-]
ρίων δύο ὀβ[ολ . . .]
Διοσκορὸς Παλ[]
δια Τρουνη<ν>ίου
θ β
8 (Second hand) = δηναρίων δύο. cp. No. 18.
21. [. . .] ὦνι Ἑρμείν]
ρι χαιρεῖν· ἐλάβον π[αρα σου
ἐκ του κιβάριου . . .]
οἶνον ≠ β Ἑρμείων
νιὸς αὐτοῦ εγραψα ὑπ(ερ) αὐτοῦ
μη εἰδ(ότος) γραμμάτα
[L] ιε Παωναι δ
≠ β
σεσημω-
με (sic)
9-10 = σεσημειῶμαι: see Wilcken, I., p. 83,
and cp. No. 4.
22. [] πελ []
[Ἀλεξ]άνδρου κι[βάριατορι χαιρ-]
[εῖν· ἐλα]βον παρα σου οἶν[ου]
[τρικερα] μόν ἐν L ιθ ≠
[.] εἰς ἑως συντιμῆθ(εν) (sic)
] . . .
23. [κιβάρια]τορι χ[αίρειν· ἐλάβον παρα
σου
[οἶνον κο]λοφώνι(ον) ἐν δ[ηναρίων
τέσ-
[σαρων L] Επειφ $\frac{x}{p}$ Ἰουλίος []
[συνε]υδάκω καὶ εγραψα []
[. . .] ἡς συνευδάκω κ[αὶ εγραψα
[. . .] Ἰέραξ κ(ι) (sic)
κ κο^α β. Ἀρηλῆς Ερμ[]
θ δ
HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE.

ON THE DATE OF THE *HERAKLES* OF EURIPIDES.

THE *Herakles* of Euripides is one of those plays concerning the date of whose first performance the grammarians are silent,¹ but study and conjecture have done much to remedy this defect,² placing the date almost certainly between 425 and 418³ and probably between 423 and 420,⁴ one editor at least giving it as his opinion, 'if a definite year is to be named,' that the play was first performed in 423.⁵ We would submit a series of considerations tending to confirm these conjectures, and to place the date of the performance of the *Herakles* in 422.

Firstly, the opening scene shows us the suppliants at an altar—the altar, we are definitely informed, of Ζεὺς σωτήρ,⁶ the locality, though not in Thebes itself, is in the territory so called,⁷ and the spot represented is an open space in front of the present home of Herakles and his family.

Now in the territory of Thebes there were probably several sanctuaries and images of Herakles in the fifth century B.C.; there certainly were many in the time of Pausanias;⁸ but of images of Zeus the Saviour in that region there is, as far as I know, only mention of one—namely, that at Thespieae.⁹ At Thespieae there was also, in Pausanias' time, a sanctuary of Herakles,¹⁰ and if the image and sanctuary existed in the fifth century, the combination of the two would have been calculated, we may reasonably suppose, to bring Thespieae to the minds of the audience who attended the performance of the *Herakles* in the theatre of Dionysus.

Now we submit that the fact that Pausanias not only states the existence of an image of Zeus the Saviour and of a sanctuary of Herakles at Thespieae, but goes at some length into their respective *raisons d'être* is enough to justify a strong presumption that the image and sanctuary were of some renown and of considerable antiquity in his time.

It is true that the altar to Zeus the Saviour, at which Amphitryon is a suppliant, is said by him to have been raised by Herakles in thanksgiving for his victory over the Minyans;¹¹ but of this altar, if such a one ever actually existed, we appear to have no historical record, whereas the image at Thespieae was apparently well known in later times.

Now in the summer of the year 423, 'Θηβαῖοι Θεσπιέων τεῖχος περιεῖλον, ἐπικαλέσαντες ἄττικισμόν, βουλόμενοι μὲν καὶ αἰεὶ, παρεστηκὸς δὲ ῥᾶον, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἀθηναίων μάχῃ ὃ, τι ἦν αὐτῶν ἄνθος ἀπολώλει.'¹²

The battle referred to is the engagement at Tanagra in 424, in which the Thespians suffered most severely: 'ὑποχωρησάντων γὰρ αὐτοῖς τῶν παρατεταγμένων, καὶ κυκλωθέντων ἐν ὀλίγῳ, οἵπερ διεφθάρησαν Θεσπιέων, ἐν χερσὶν ἄμυνόμενοι κατεκόπησαν. καὶ τινες καὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων, διὰ τὴν κύκλωσιν ταραχθέντες, ἡγήροσαν τε καὶ ἀπέκτειναν ἀλλήλους.'¹³

If the Thebans had long wished to punish the Thespians for atticism, we must assume they had some reason for doing so, especially in view of the brave stand the latter had made at Tanagra; in other words, the Thespians must at some time have given help to the Athenians. It would, under the circumstances, be only natural for a strong feeling to prevail at Athens that the Athenians ought to march out against the Thebans and help the Thespians, who at some previous time had given succour to the Athenians and thus incurred ruin on their account.

¹ The Hypothesis may have contained these particulars, but it is not complete in the MSS.

² See especially Miss Grace McCurdy's *Chronology of the Extant Plays of Euripides* and Wilamowitz, *Herakles*, 12, p. 134 ff.

³ Euripides, *Herakles*, with introduction and notes by O. R. A. Byrde, M.A. Oxford, 1914.

⁴ *Euripidis Fabulae*, ed. G. Murray, Vol. II., *Herakles*.

⁵ O. R. A. Byrde, *op. cit.*

⁶ l. 48.

⁷ *Four Plays of Euripides*, by A. W. Verrall, p. 142.

⁸ Paus. IX. 11. 4 and 6; IX. 24. 3; IX. 25. 4; IX. 26. 1; IX. 27. 6 and 8; IX. 32. 2 and 4; IX. 34. 5; IX. 38. 6.

⁹ Paus. IX. 26. 7.

¹⁰ Paus. IX. 27. 6.

¹¹ l. 49.

¹² Thucydides, IV. 133.

¹³ Thuc. IV. 96.

Signs are not wanting to show that the *Herakles* may well have been a play with a partly political motive—namely, the encouragement of the feeling against the Thebans and in favour of the Thespians.

Reading the lines 217-235, we see they might well have been spoken by some aged Thespian, powerless to defend his city from the dishonour imposed upon it by Thebes:

ὦ γαῖα Κόδμου· καὶ γὰρ ἐς σ' ἀφίξομαι
λόγους δνειδιστήρας ἐνδοτούμενος·
τοιαῦτ' ἀμύνεθ' Ἡρακλεῖ τέκνοισί τε ;
ὅς εἰς Μινύαισι πᾶσι διὰ μάχης μολῶν
Θήβαις ἔθηκεν ὄμμι' ἐλευθερον βλέπειν.
οὐδ' Ἑλλάδ' ἦνευ'—οὐδ' ἀνέξομαι ποτε
σιγῶν—κακίστην λαμβάνων ἐς παῖδ' ἐμὸν,
ἣν χρὴν νεοσσοῖς τοῖσδε πῦρ λόγχας ὅπλα
φέρουσιν εἰθεῖν, ποτῶν καθαρμάτων
χέρσου τ' ἀμοιβάς—ὣν ἐμόχθησας χάριν.
τὰ δ', ὦ τέκν', ὑμῖν οὐτε Θηβαίων πόλις
οὐθ' Ἑλλάς ἀρκεῖ· πρὸς δ' ἐμ' ἀσθενῆ φίλον
δεδόρκατ', οὐδὲν δυνάει γλῶσσης ψόφον.
ῥώμῃ γὰρ ἐκκλειομένη ἦν πρὶν εἰλκεν,
γῆρας δὲ τρομερὰ γυῖα κάμαυρον σθένος.
εἰ δ' ἡ νέος τε καὶ σώματος κρατῶν,
λαβὼν ἂν ἔγχος τοῦδε τοῖς ξανθοῖς πλόκου
καθημάτωσ' ἂν, ὥστ' Ἀτλαντικῶν πέραν
φεύγειν ἔραν ἂν δεῖλα τοῦμιν ὄδρῳ.

Other passages of this nature are not wanting in our play.¹

It may be objected that the Athenians would hardly wish to help men

who, like the Thespians, had fought against them, and fought bravely and well. To this the latter part of our play may perhaps furnish some answer: 'The moment's madness when Athenians fought against Thespians (aye, and Athenians against Athenians too!) on the field of Tanagra, is past! Thespieae has paid for it, and paid dearly, by the loss of the flower of her sons! Shall Athens let her go down in utter ruin, that Thespieae who helped her in other days? Surely it is inconceivable.'

We think we are justified in seeing some trace of such an idea in the play before us, and in applying it in support of the contention that the *Herakles* was performed at the City Dionysia of 422.

Another slight indication, apparently pointing in the same direction, may perhaps be found in ll. 1303-1310, and in other slighting references to the goddess Hera, *passim*, in view of the fact that the temple of that goddess at Argos was burnt down in the summer of 423;² but this is more likely to be a chance coincidence.

J. A. SPRANGER.

Florence, 1919.

¹ E.g., ll. 312-326, 498-502.

² Thuc. IV. 133.

ADDITIONS TO THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY.

PROFESSOR GRENFELL has kindly given me some further references to Greek Papyri, which complete the additions to the *Greek Anthology* up to the present time. See the classification in *Classical Review*, XXXII. 187, and XXXIII. 36.

Additions to Class 1: P. Petrie ii. XLIX. (b), p. 158, ed. Mahaffy. Of the third century B.C.; in the Bodleian; the first of the series of Anthologies which have been discovered. It contains fragments of four-lined poems by writers named [Sosi-?]phanes, Aristarchus, [Pol-?]ydamas, (or [Ast]ydamas, Grenfell), Cratinus: this is more likely than that the poems are addressed to these persons.

Additions to Class 3: P. Freiburg; W. Aly in *Sitzungsb. Heidelberg Akad.*

1914. Fragments of two anonymous Epigrams in which Erginus, the helmsman of the *Argo*, is mentioned, and also under the title of Ἡρακλεώτης, Idmon; see Schol. Ap. Rhod. ii. 845. Aly quotes *Callim. Fr.* 197, Ἐργίνος Κλυμένου ἔξοχος ἐν σταδίῳ, and since Ἐργίνος in the Papyrus stands as the first word in a pentameter, and the next and only letter is a doubtful σ, he sees an 'attractive coincidence,' and thinks that this may be a fragment of Callimachus.

Revue de Philologie, XIX. 177 = P. *Brit. Mus.* 256, by F. G. Kenyon; Papyrus of the first half of the first century; H. Weil, *ibid.*, p. 180. An anonymous elegiac poem of fourteen lines on the conquest of Egypt by Augustus, and in commemoration of the battle of Actium. Since the title Σεβαστός ap-

pears, the epigram was not composed before 27 B.C. The author was probably a Greek of Alexandria. The poem contains some bold and striking expressions, such as εἰρήνης εὐώπιδος, and αἰῶνος στόμασιν βεβοημένε.

A Papyrus at Hamburg, published by Wilamowitz in *Sitzungsb. preuss. Akad.* 1918, p. 736, of the middle of the third century B.C. Seventeen mutilated lines of an elegiac poem giving the account of the interview of an envoy with a king. Since θούρος ἀνὴρ Γαλάτης is mentioned, with a description of the Gauls' hardy life, the poem seems to have narrated some incident of the Gauls' invasion of Asia and their settlement. These references point to Attalus I., and, if one may conjecture the name of the author, it might be Musaeus of Ephesus, who, according to Suidas, wrote poems on Eumenes and Attalus (not necessarily Attalus II., as Susemihl suggests). Wilamowitz however thinks that the pressure of some danger points to the king being a Seleucid. The style is vigorous, but not quite as polished as the best Alexandrian. Since we know so little of this period of Greek history, this fragment is particularly tantalising.

P. Petrie ii. XLIX. (a), p. 157; in the British Museum. Fragments of a Hellenistic poem, called by O. Crusius in *Philologus*, 1894, p. 12, 'ein Hochzeitsgedicht?' It exhibits all the signs of the Callimachean school, reconдите allusion, rare words, polished metre.

P. Oxyrh. 15, third century. Short songs for the flute ending with the note αὔλει μοι, as Wilamowitz has rightly divided αὐλειμοι: *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1898,

695. The lines appears to be ἐξάμετροι μειούροι. W. Crönert in *Archiv f. Paph.* I. 113.

Additions to Class 3, 6: Fragments of Epigrams of the τίνες ἂν εἴποι λόγους type, *P. Oxyrh.* 671. 'The abbreviations ω or νι may give the name of the poet, e.g. Nicarchus' (Grenfell and Hunt).

Mélanges Nicole, p. 615 = *P. Heidelberg* 1273, edited by G. A. Gerhard and O. Crusius; of the sixth century. Six exercises on mythological subjects, 'the most trivial school mythology.' With them may be compared the seven Hexameters in *Philologus*, 1905, 145, of Nonnus' time = *Bull. Corr. Hellén.* 1904, p. 208.

Addition to Class 4: *P. Freiburg* 4, of the first century B.C.; W. Aly in *Sitzungsb. Heidelb. Akad.* 1914, p. 58, containing fragments of the Epigram of Posidippus in *Anth. Pal.* XVI. 119. The author's name is conjecturally inserted by Aly; it is a pity that it has disappeared from the text, since it might have thrown light on the question who the author was, for in the view of P. Schott, the editor of *Posidippus*, p. 53, it was not Posidippus.

Addition to Class 4, 3: Fragments of Meleager's Epigram in *Anthol. Pal.* V. 151 (152 Paton); Wilamowitz in *Sitzungsb. preuss. Akad.* 1918, p. 750. It is a small fragment which joins on to the end of the Epigrams by Meleager published in the *Berlin Klass. Texte*, V. 1, 75. It is interesting as confirming the conjecture of Pierson and Graefe, accepted by Mr. Paton, but not by Stadtmueller or Duebner, δοπα, for δοπαῖς of Pal.

J. U. POWELL.

NIHIL IN OVID.

In the *Classical Quarterly* for 1916, vol. X pp. 138 f., I considered Lachmann's doctrine of the Ovidian prosody of *nihil* together with the evidence alleged against it, and concluded that judgment on the controversy must be held in suspense. Before proceeding further let me rehearse the facts and contentions. It is Lachmann's precept,

delivered in *Kl. Schr.* II p. 59 and at *Lucr.* I 159, that Ovid used only *nil* and *nihil*, not *nihil*. For *nihil* he adduced

met. VII 644 in superis opis esse *nihil*. at in aedibus ingens,
trist. V 14 41 morte *nihil* opus est pro me sed amore fideque,
ex Pont. III 1 113 morte *nihil* opus est, n(ih)il Icarotide tela;

to which I added

met. XIV 24 fine *nil* opus est; partem ferat
illa caloris,

where the main tradition of the MSS is corrupt and gives *fineque nil* or rather *et neque nil*. The one instance of *nihil* which he found,

her. XIX 170 exiguum, sed plus quam *nihil*,
illud erat,

he reckoned among the features assigning that epistle to another hand than Ovid's. Merkel opposed him with

trist. V 8 2 te quoque sim, inferius quo *nihil*
esse potest,

and Lucian Mueller with

trist. IV 8 38 mitius inmensus quo *nihil* orbis
habet;

but I remarked that the distich containing the former of these two examples is on other grounds suspect, and that the latter could, if need were, be removed by an easy and even plausible transposition. Wherever else in Ovid's text the form *nihil* is followed by a vowel, the metre allows *nil*; and the spelling of MSS, which often offer *nihil* where only *nil* is metrical, has no claim to represent the spelling or pronunciation of the author.

I can now settle the question by means of an observation which I ought to have made before, and so indeed ought Lachmann. I have collected all the verses in which this word, call it *nil* or *nihil*, constitutes the latter half of the first foot. There are twenty examples, or, if a suspected epistle is included, twenty-one; and they are these.

her. XVII 127 sed *nihil* infirmo.

art. I 519 et *nihil* emineant.

art. II 280 si *nihil* attuleris.

remed. 410 et *nihil* est.

met. VI 465 et *nihil* est.

met. VII 830 quod *nihil* est.

met. IX 628 ut *nihil* adiciam.

met. X 520 et *nihil* est.

met. XIII 266 at *nil* inpendit.

fast. I 445 sed *nil* ista.

trist. I 8 8 et *nihil* est.

trist. V 5 51 si *nihil* infesti.

trist. V 14 26 et *nihil* officio.

ex Pont. II 2 56 an *nihil* expedit.

ex Pont. II 3 33 te *nihil* ex.

ex Pont. II 7 46 et *nihil* inueni.

ex Pont. III 1 47 ut *nihil* ipse.

ex Pont. III 1 127 qua *nihil* in.

ex Pont. IV 8 15 at *nihil* hic.

ex Pont. IV 14 23 sed *nihil* admisi.

Ib. 284 cui *nil* rethet.

Eighteen where the MSS have *nihil*, three where they have *nil*. But, with the single exception of the last instance, the word, however spelt, is always followed by a vowel; and that exception is of the sort which proves a rule. In the couplet

nec tibi subsidio praesens sit numen, ut illi
cui *nil* rethet profuit ara Iouis,

rethet, which can only be interpreted *Rhoetei*, is rejected by the sense, which demands *Hercei*; and so vanishes the consonant. Now this perpetually attendant circumstance can be no result of chance. Words having the metrical properties of *nil* are often placed by Ovid in this part of the verse with a consonant after them: *remed.* 138 'haec sunt iucundi', 426 'non sunt iudiciis', 507 'nec dic blanditias', 694 'nec dic quid', 701 'nec nos purpureas'. *nil* itself is so placed by other poets: *Lucr.* II 7 'sed *nil* dulcius', 673 'si *nil* praeterea' (in both of which instances the MSS have *nihil*), *Hor. serm.* I 1 49 'qui *nil* portarit', *Mart.* I 98 2 'sed *nil* patrono', *III* 61 2 'si *nil* Cinna'. Ovid must have had a motive for saddling himself with this restriction; but if he meant the word for a monosyllable he can have had none. His only imaginable motive was to procure a dactyl instead of a spondee for the first foot. *nihil* therefore in the eighteen verses where it occurs is a pyrrhic, and *nil* in the three others should be changed to *nihil*. This may be done without scruple; for although scribes are less prone to write *nil* for *nihil* than *nihil* for *nil*, the error is both common and early: B and R are two of Horace's best and oldest MSS, yet the one at *carm.* I 28 12 and the other at *IV* 2 37 gives *nil* where the metre proves that Horace wrote *nihil*. And *nihil* was printed in all our three verses by Heinsius, who carried into practice the rule which Seruius tried and failed to formulate at *Virg. Aen.* VI 104,¹ and

¹ 'si pars sequens orationis a uocali inchoet, *nihil* dicimus, ut (II 402) "heu *nihil* inuitis fas quemquam fidere diuis"; si autem a consonante inchoet, *nil* ponimus, ut Iuuenalis (IV 22)

read *nihil* wherever metre gave him the chance, without regard to the spelling of the MSS. Merkel's practice on the other hand was to preserve the spelling of the MSS unless metre forbade him; and at *met.* XIII 266 and *fast.* I 445 he has been followed by all subsequent editors in retaining *nil*, which Guethling and I retained also at *Ib.* 284 when changing *rethei* to *Hercei*, because it was irrational to introduce *nihil* in this verse and not in the other two. But the facts which I have just set forth put a new complexion on the case, and show that Ovid wrote *nihil* in all three places.

In the second and third and fourth foot of the hexameter the case stands otherwise, and Ovid unquestionably admitted *nil*, as at *met.* XV 92 'terra creat, *nil* te nisi tristia mandere saeuo', *amor.* II 1 19 'Juppiter, ignoscas: *nil* me tua tela iuuabant', *ex Pont.* I 1 7 'a quotiens dixi: certe *nil* turpe docetis'. But yet verses where a vowel follows and leaves the form of the word in doubt are much more numerous: *met.* VII 567 'utile enim *nihil* est', XV 177, *trist.* II 195, III 4 51, *ex Pont.* I 2 65; *amor.* III 8 29 'nihil esse potentius auro', *art.* II 365, 599, *met.* V 221, VI 25, 305, VII 67, XIII 100, XIV 730, XV 165, 629, *fast.* VI 177, *trist.* I 2 23, II 23, II 259, III 1 9, 13 23, *ex Pont.* III 1 113, *her.* XX 99; *met.* III 590 'nihil ille reliquit', V 273, VI 685, IX 148, *ex Pont.* I 1 21, 7 25. The MSS or the best part of them (except that at *met.* XV 165 authority is about equally divided) give *nihil* in all these verses, and so does Heinsius; Merkel and his followers diverge at one place only, *trist.* III 13 23 'nihil exorantia diuos', where all of them except Guethling print *nil*, though four out of the five best MSS have *nihil*. In two verses *nihil* is certainly to be preferred, *met.* V 273 'sed (uetitum est adeo sceleri *nihil*) omnia terrent' and VI 685 'ast, ubi blanditiis agitur *nihil*, horridus ira', where *nil* would create a rhythm less acceptable to Ovid. Some might say

"*nil* tale expectes: emit sibi. multa uidemus". One sees what he wants to say, though he has not said it: he does not really mean that he writes or pronounces 'te sine *nihil* altum mens incohat' in *georg.* III 42, nor 'ille *nil*, nec me quaerentem uana moratur' in *Aen.* II 287.

that at three other places we have guidance for our choice: that in *met.* XIII. 100 'luce *nihil* gestum, *nihil* est Diomede remoto' and XV. 629 'temptamenta *nihil*, *nihil* artes posse medentum' the one *nihil* defends the other, and that in *art.* II 365 '*nil* Helene peccat, *nihil* hic committit adulter' *nil* in the first place recommends *nil* in the second. But any such expectation of uniformity is shown to be fallacious by Catull. 17 21 '*nil* uidet, *nihil* audit', 42 21 '*sed nil* proficimus, *nihil* mouetur', 64 146 '*nil* metuunt iurare, *nihil* promittere parcant', Virg. *buc.* II 6 f. 'o crudelis Alexi, *nihil* mea carmina curas? [*nil* nostri miserere?]', Sen. *Med.* 163 'qui *nil* potest sperare, desperet *nihil*', Mart. II 3 1 'Sexte, *nihil* debes, *nil* debes, Sexte', Iuu. VI 212 f. '*nil* umquam inuita donabis coniuge, uendes| hac opstante *nihil*'; and it is manifest that nothing, neither *nihil* nor *nil*, can bring about uniformity in *ex Pont.* III 1 113 'morte *nihil* opus est, *nihil* Icarotide tela'.

Ovid's practice in respect of the first foot appears to be that of most dactylic poets later than Lucretius. Even in Horace and Martial, who allow a consonant to follow, a vowel is much more frequent, and it is invariable in Catullus, Virgil, Tibullus, Propertius, Manilius, Persius, Calpurnius, the Aetna, Lucan, Silius (if I can trust a rapid examination)¹ and Juvenal, though in many of them the number of examples is too small to establish a rule.

About Juvenal I have a short story to tell. The disputed word forms the latter half of the first foot in three verses, VI 331 '*si nihil* est', VII 54 '*qui nihil* expositum', XIII 18 '*an nihil* in melius'. In all three the MSS, or most of them, give the form *nihil*, and so did the editions down to 1886. In that year Buecheler introduced *nil* from the Pithoeanus at VII 54, leaving *nihil* in the two other verses; and his sheep followed him as their tails did them. He was disregarding authority as well as reason, for *nihil* is given at VII 54 not only by the most and best of the inferior MSS but by the lemma

¹ In Valerius Flaccus and Statius I have noticed no example of *nihil* or *nil* in this situation.

of the ancient scholia, which is as good a witness as the Pithoeanus itself; but reason and authority together are no match for that passion of love which is inspired in modern scholars by MSS whose names begin with a P. In my edition of 1905 I made a brief remark on the circumstances and restored *nihil*. The result of my action deserves to be put on record as exemplifying the customs of classical scholarship in the twentieth century. Buecheler, though

placing *nil* in his text, had exhibited in his apparatus criticus and in his excerpts from the scholia the facts which I have stated, '*nihil* S ω', 'qui nihil expositum'. It was safe to print this evidence so long as nobody took any notice of it; but as soon as I gave it effect by promoting *nihil* to the text, the case was altered. The fetish was in danger, the facts must be suppressed, and Leo in his edition of 1910 suppressed them.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

PHAEDRUS AND QUINTILIAN I. 9. 2.

A REPLY TO PROFESSOR POSTGATE.

IN the February—March, 1919, number of the *Review*, Professor Postgate writes as follows:

'We can hardly doubt that the poet of *Inst. Or.* I. 9. 2 who composed "Aesopi fabellas . . . sermone puro et nihil se supra modum extollente" and whose "gracilitas" is to be reproduced in the school exercises, was Phaedrus. The Fables then, or rather a selection from them, were a schoolbook at Rome towards the end of the first century A.D.'

With the implied interpretation of the passage in question I entirely disagree. The question whether Phaedrus was used as a school-book at Rome is another matter. On this, too, I differ from the writer, but I speak with less confidence. I may add that the whole of the ninth chapter is important in the history of ancient schools and well worth elucidation.

The whole passage runs thus:

'igitur AESOPI FABELLAS, quae fabulis nutricularum proxime succedunt, narrare sermone puro et nihil se supra modum extollente, deinde eandem gracilitatem stilo exigere condisant: VERSUS primo solvere, mox mutatis verbis interpretari: tum paraphrasi audacius vertere, qua et brevare quaedam et exornare salvo modo poetae sensu permittitur. quod opus, etiam consummatis professoribus (? profectibus) difficile, qui commode tractaverit, cuicumque discendo sufficit. SENTENTIAE quoque et CHIRIAE et ETHOLOGIAE | (? aetiology) subiectis dictorum rationibus apud grammaticos scribantur, quia initium ex lectione ducunt: quorum omnis similis est ratio, forma diversa.'

This ninth chapter deals with the 'progymnasmata' or forms of exercise in original composition, of which we have full accounts in Hermogenes (with

Priscian's translation), Aphthonius and Theon. All these exercises were, strictly speaking, 'rhetorical,' being preparations for the full dress declamation. But Quintilian complains that through the laches of the 'rhetores' they had fallen into the hands of the 'grammatici,' and his object in this chapter is to suggest a compromise by which the more elementary exercises, and these only, might be retained in the lower school. From the dozen or more in vogue we may say that he selects two as suitable for this purpose. The first is the *μῦθος* or, more exactly, *μῦθος Αἰσώπειος*, for our Greek authorities are careful to say that what we call fables are all known by the name of Aesop, whether they were attributed to Aesop or not. The other is the 'Chria' and its varieties the *γνώμη* or 'sententia' and the doubtful 'ethology.' All these are evidently little moral essays, founded on some saying or significant action, and it will be convenient to speak of them under the single name of 'Chria.' Another exercise, the *διήγησις*, he only accepts under the limitation 'narratiunculas a poetis celebratas notitiae causa non eloquentiae tractandas puto.' That is, if we come across an allusion to Orpheus in our books, the 'grammaticus' may set the boy to write out the story of Orpheus, in his own words, to see that he knows it, but it should not like the other two be used as a set composition. From this point of view it is reserved for the higher school.

Now I think it is perfectly clear from the words themselves that the injunction that boys should learn to tell or write fables 'sermone puro' or 'gracili' has nothing whatever to do with Phaedrus or any other fabulist, but merely refers to the style required from the pupil. And this is confirmed by the Greek parallels. Hermogenes says that the style in the *μῦθος* must be *περίοδων ἀλλοτρία τῆς γλυκύτητος ἐγγύς*. Theon, who on other grounds puts the *χρεία* before the *μῦθος*, says that in the latter the style must be *ἀπλουστέρα* than in the former. I think Dr. Postgate may have been misled by the 'eandem.' The meaning is, I take it, that the 'fable' composition has two stages—the first oral (what the Germans, I think, call a Vortrag), the second written, but in both cases the same simplicity of style is required.

We have now to note that between the 'Aesop fable' and the 'Chria' Quintilian interpolates another exercise, which is not, strictly speaking, one of the 'progymnasmata.' Take a piece of verse,¹ he says, and (1) write it out in prose order, (2) suggest synonyms, (3) paraphrase, *précis*, or expand it, while retaining the writer's meaning. The directions bear a close resemblance to a question which I have often set as an examiner in Shakespeare in the Cambridge Locals, the formula of which runs thus: 'Put the following passage into modern prose so as to bring out clearly the full meaning.'

When I say that paraphrase was not, 'strictly speaking,' one of the 'progymnasmata,' I mean that, while it does not appear in the detailed accounts, Theon does dwell on it in his prefatory matter, and it was clearly practised in the rhetoric school, though rather as a parallel and auxiliary to the declamation than as a preliminary. Some surprise may be felt that Quintilian, who tells us that it is a difficult job even under the crack rhetoricians² (much more under the 'grammaticus'), should advo-

cate it at this early stage. I suspect that he shared the belief which still makes me advocate it. The candidates often make a terrible mess of it, but I hold to it as the best antidote against reading poetry without thought for the exact meaning.

I believe then that the words 'versus . . . permittitur' have nothing to do with the 'fable.' It is true that, as the construction after 'condiscant' runs on, we have to print them in the same sentence, but that is not a real consideration.³ It is, however, true that nothing which I have said at present argues against the possibility that Phaedrus (and I presume Babrius, for Quintilian has been legislating for Greek studies as well as Latin) were used for paraphrasing. I will deal with that later, but at any rate there is no reason to think that they are *exclusively* meant. It is hardly credible that the exercise should begin and end with the fabulists.

It may indeed be asked why, seeing that the 'fable' and the 'Chria' are both in a way original compositions, while the paraphrase is of a different nature, it is placed between them. The answer is, I think, that Quintilian names the exercises in the order in which he thinks they should be taken up. It is very noteworthy that he grounds his approval of the Chria, etc., on the fact that they 'initium ex lectione ducunt.' In other words he believes in the correlation of studies, and wishes the composition subjects, when possible, to be connected with the literature. The reading in Homer and Virgil might easily supply the periodical 'Chria.' It is true, however, that most of those reported to us come from prose sources which would not enter into class reading in the grammatical school. But I presume a little ingenuity might easily forge a connection between them and the poets read. A very favourite 'Chria' seems to have been 'Isocrates said that the roots of *παιδεία* were bitter, but its fruits sweet.' This might easily be connected with a story of a

¹ 'versus' and 'poetae' of course, because no prose was 'apud grammaticos' at Rome at this time.

² So Spalding takes 'consummatis professoribus,' but, as he says, it is harsh; on the other hand, if we take it as dative the statement seems exaggerated. I am much inclined to Sarpe's

'profectibus,' = highly advanced pupils, a phrase which has good parallels in Quintilian.

³ It may be observed that each exercise is introduced by its leading noun, which I have indicated by printing them in capitals.

hero who was chastened by misfortune into wisdom and happiness. Odysseus or Aeneas would do for the purpose. It was perhaps some such reminiscence of his youth which induced the 'Auctor ad Hebraeos' to introduce this very Chria into his twelfth chapter *à propos* of the divine *maudela* of the Church.

I imagine then that Quintilian wished the 'Chria,' etc., as a composition exercise, to be taken up when the class, having been trained in literary appreciation on the admirable principles laid down in the seventeenth section of the previous chapter, had arrived at some idea of the 'laudandum in sensibus.' The easiest form of paraphrasing could be started earlier, and the 'Aesopi fabella' was, I suggest, pre-literary. Its groundwork lay in simple children's

stories just above the 'nutricularum fabulae,' and the style was intended to correspond. And the inference I draw from the way in which Quintilian speaks of it, as compared with the other two exercises, is that neither Phaedrus nor Babrius, nor any other poetical fabulist, was used in the schools. This is in itself, no doubt, a speculative argument, but it is confirmed, I think, by two solid facts. If Phaedrus was read, we should have expected some mention, if not of his name, at any rate of his type, in the eighth chapter. And, if the indices are to be trusted, not a single quotation from him is to be found in the whole body of extant 'grammatici' and 'rhetores.' Is this compatible with his use as a school text? It seems to me very doubtful.

F. H. COLSON.

VIRGIL, AENEID 6. 859.

Adspice ut insignis spoliis Marcellus opimis
ingreditur uictorque uiros supereminet omnes.
hic rem Romanam magno turbante tumultu
sistet eques, sternet Poenos Gallumque re-
bellem,

tertiaque arma patri suspendet capta Quirino.

Marcellus, according to Plutarch, *Marc.* 8. and Propertius, 4. 10, dedicated the *spolia opima*, won from the Gallic chief Virdomarus, to Jupiter Feretrius. Why then does Virgil make him dedicate them to *pater Quirinus*?

The answer is to be found in Festus and Plutarch. Servius saw dimly where the truth lay, as his note shows.

SERVIUS. After a futile attempt to explain *capta Quirino* as *qualia et Quirinus cepit*, *id est Romulus (patri on this view = Ioui)*, he continues 'possumus et, quod est melius, secundum legem Numae hunc locum accipere, qui praecepit prima spolia opima Ioui Feretrio debere suspendi, quod iam Romulus fecerat; secunda Marti, quod Cossus fecit; tertia Quirino, quod fecit Marcellus. Quirinus autem est Mars qui praeest paci et intra ciuitatem colitur: nam belli Mars extra ciuitatem templum habuit. . . . uarie de hoc loco tractant commentatores, Numae legis immemores, cuius facit mentionem et Liuius.'

For this *lex Numae* we must have recourse to Plutarch and Festus, Livy's reference to the law having apparently been made in one of the lost books.

FESTUS, p. 202 Lindsay, 'opima magnifica et ampla, unde spolia quoque quae dux populi Romani duci hostium detraxit: quorum tanta raritas est ut intra annos paulo (*lacuna of nineteen letters*) trina contigerint nomini Romano: una quae Romulus de Acrone; altera quae Cossus Cornelius de Tolumnio; tertia quae Marcellus Ioui Feretrio de Virdomaro fixerunt. M. Varro ait opima spolia esse etiam si manipularis miles detraxerit dummodo duci hostium *sed prima esse quae dux duci neque enim quae a duce capta*¹ non sint ad aedem Iouis Feretri poni: testimonio esse libros pontificum in quibus ait: "pro primis spoliis boue, pro secundis solitaurilibus, pro tertiis agno publice fieri debere: i esse etiam Pompili regis legem opimorum spoliiorum talem: 'cuius auspicio classe procincta opima spolia capiuntur, Ioui Feretrio dari oportet, et bouem caedito; qui cepit, CCC dari oportet. secunda spolia in Martis ara in Campo, solitaur-

¹ Words in italics conjecturally supplied by Hertzberg.

ilia ultra uoluerit caedito; qui cepit, ei aeris CC dato. tertia spolia Ianui Quirino agnum marem caedito; C qui ceperit ex aere dato. cuius auspicio captum dis piaculum dato.'""

PLUTARCH, *Marc.* 8:

καὶ τοὶ φασὶν ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν Νουμῶν Πομπηλίου καὶ πρώτων ὀπιμίων καὶ δευτέρων καὶ τρίτων μνημονεύειν. τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ληφθέντα τῷ Φερετρίῳ Διὶ κελεύοντα καθιεροῦν, τὰ δεύτερα δὲ τῷ Ἀρεὶ, τὰ δὲ τρίτα τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ λαμβάνειν γέρας ἀσάρα τριακῶσια τῶν πρώτων, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον διακῶσια, τὸν δὲ τρίτον ἑκατόν. ὁ μὲντοι πολλὸς οὗτος ἐπικρατεῖ λόγος ὡς ἐκείνων μόνων ὀπιμίων ὄντων, ὅσα καὶ παρατάξεως οὐσῆς καὶ πρῶτα καὶ στρατηγῶν ἀνελόντος.

From the above passages it is clear that *prima*, *secunda* and *tertia* were used in two different senses in connexion with the *spolia opima*; (1) with regard to chronological order and reference to the three occasions on which Roman generals won them; (2) in the sense of *first*, *second*, and *third* class. Norden, it is true, gives a different interpretation: 'Nach einer anderen Tradition, die auf ein Gesetz des Numa zurückgeführt wurde, war die Ehre nicht in diesen engen Grenzen eingeschlossen, sondern die drei ersten Soldaten, die je einen Feind spolierten, brachten die drei Spolien der Reihe nach dem Jupiter Feretrius, dem Mars und dem Quirinus dar.' This interpretation, however, is improbable from every point of view, and is not borne out by the statements of Festus and Plutarch. The obvious interpretation of the passages in question is that given by Hertzberg, to the effect that there were three classes of *spolia opima* won by (1) the actual general, (2) officers other than the general, (3) a common soldier, and the rewards and the place of dedication varied accordingly (see *Philologus*, I. p. 331). That officers other than the general could win *spolia opima* is borne out by Florus (2. 17. 11, 'Vaccaeos de quibus Scipio ille posterior singulari certamine, cum rex fuerat prouocator, opima rettulerat'), and by Valerius Maximus (3. 2. 6, 'eodem uirtutis et pugnae genere uti sunt P. Manlius Torquatus et Valerius Coruinus et Cornelius Scipio. hi nempe ultro prouocantes hostium duces interemerant, sed quia alienis auspiciis rem gesserant, spolia Ioui Feretrio non posuerunt consecranda'). Cp. also Dio Cassius 51. 24.

It is also clear that the term *spolia opima* had come to be generally accepted only as referring to the first class. Further, both Cossus and Marcellus had actually dedicated their *spolia* to Jupiter Feretrius. See Livy (4. 20), who had actually seen the spoils dedicated by Cossus, Plutarch (*Marc.* 8.), and Propertius (4. 10). It may, therefore, be assumed that the second and third classes of *spolia opima* provided for by Numa's law had become obsolete.

How then account for Virgil's statement that Marcellus was destined to dedicate his spoils to Quirinus? That the statement is historically false can scarcely be denied, though it is conceivable that other traditions may have existed. But Virgil, being, as he was, passionately devoted to ancient lore and acquainted with the *lex Numae*, determined to accept its authority. He mistook the meaning of *prima*, *secunda*, and *tertia*, and assumed that they referred to the chronological order of the winning, and not to the class of spoil won. It would not be difficult to misinterpret the *lex Numae*. Or it is possible that Virgil did not make the mistake himself, but followed some older authority who had committed himself to this not unnatural misinterpretation. No other interpretation of the passage would seem possible in face of the evidence. Identification of Quirinus with Jupiter Feretrius is unwarrantable, as is the assumption that there was a statue of Quirinus in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius; even if there were any evidence for this last supposition, it would not justify Virgil's statement.

Who is *pater Quirinus*? The *lex Numae* tells us that he is Ianus Quirinus, another name for Ianus Geminus, the two-faced Ianus of the Forum, whose gates were closed in times of peace: cp. Hor. *Od.* 4. 15. 9, *Mon. Anc. Lat.* 2. 42, Suet. Aug. 22. But *pater Quirinus* would more naturally refer to the ancient deity Quirinus, who forms one of a triad with Jupiter and Mars, a fact which suits the context in the *lex Numae* admirably well: cp. Serv. ad. *Aen.* 8. 663, 'salios qui sunt in tutela Iouis Martis Quirini'; Livy 8. 9, 'Iane, Jupiter, Mars, pater Quirine'; 5. 52, 'Mars Gradiue, tuque Quirine pater.'

That Quirinus was at any rate in some aspects a war-god is clear from Macrobius. 1. 9. 16, Plut. *Rom.* 29, Dion. Hal. 2. 48 (= Ἐρνώλιος). But the whole question of the functions of Quirinus is so obscure that it is impossible to deter-

mine, with any precision, his relations either to Ianus or to the *spolia opima* (see Wissowa, *Rel. und Kult.* p. 139).

H. E. BUTLER.

University College,
London.

NOTES

THUCYDIDES II. 48.

αὐτὸς τε νοσήσας καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδὼν ἄλλους πάσχοντας. Since Mr. Mair has yet again called attention to this vexed passage, I take the opportunity of defending by some parallels that innocent double αὐτός, which has been so unjustly assailed by distinguished scholars. Plato, *Politicus*, 268 A, αὐτὸς τῆς ἀγέλης τροφὸς ὁ βουφορβὸς, αὐτὸς ἰατρός, αὐτὸς οἶον νυμφευτής. Lysias XII. 68, αὐτὸς ἐπαγγεγυλάμενος σώσειν τὴν πόλιν αὐτὸς ἀπώλεσε. Aeschines III. 10, εἰ φανήσεται ὁ αὐτὸς ἀνὴρ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει, τυχὸν δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἐνιαυτῷ, πρῶτην μὲν ποτε ἀναγορευόμενος . . . ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς ἀνὴρ μικρὸν ἐπισχῶν ἔξεισιν: cf. Dinarchus I. 86. Xenophon, *Hell.* II. 3, 28, νῦν δὲ αὐτὸς μὲν ἄρξας τῆς πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους πίστεως καὶ φιλίας, αὐτὸς δὲ τῆς τοῦ δήμου καταλύσεως. *Ibid.* 32, αὐτὸς οὐκ ἀνελόμενος ὅμως τῶν στρατηγῶν κατηγορῶν ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτοὺς ἵνα αὐτὸς περισωθῇ. *Anab.* III. 2, 4, αὐτὸς ὁμόσας ἡμῖν, αὐτὸς δεξιὰς δούς, αὐτὸς ἔξαπατήσας συνέλαβε τοὺς στρατηγοὺς. At first sight Galen, vol. xix., p. 371, οἶον τε αὐτὸ ἦν καὶ αὐτὸ συμμιχθὲν ἀπεκρίθη, looks similar, but that sentence is corrupt: qu. οἶον δὲ (or καὶ οἶον) τοῦτο ἦν? The emphasis gained by doubling αὐτὸς varies in these passages, but certainly the Greeks have no objection to emphasising their meaning by such a method.

ARTHUR PLATT.

University College,
London.

EMENDATION OF THEOPHRASTUS, CHARACTERS.

In Theophrastus, *Characters*, No. V., Jebb's edition, v. 17 ff., the MS. text reads:

καὶ τὸ δλον δεινὸς τῷ τοιοῦτῳ τρόπῳ τοῦ λόγου χρῆσθαι· οὐ πιστεύω· οὐχ ὑπολαμβάνω· ἐκπλήττομαι· καὶ λέγει ἑαυτὸν ἕτερον γεγονέναι, καὶ μὴν οὐ ταῦτα πρὸς ἐμὲ διεξήει· παράδοξόν μοι τὸ πρᾶγμα· ἄλλω τινι λέγε· ὅπως δὲ σοὶ ἀπιστήσω ἢ ἐκείνῳ καταγνῶ ἀποροῦμαι· ἄλλ' ὅρα μὴ σὺ θάττον πιστεύεις.

This passage has called forth a large number of emendations. Editors seem to be agreed that the corruption is concealed in the words: καὶ λέγει ἑαυτὸν ἕτερον γεγονέναι. Of these again, ἕτερον is clearly suspect. We cannot defend it with Casaubon. To change ἕτερον γεγονέναι into ἑτέρου ἀκηκοέναι with Petersen and Jebb is too violent a remedy and cannot be defended on palaeographical grounds.

Read ἐταῖρον for ἕτερον and put a stop after ἐκπλήττομαι and a colon after γεγονέναι. The Ironical Man's line of reasoning is as follows: This man whom you claim to have told you this extraordinary piece of news has been a close friend of mine. Surely, of all people, he would have told me about it. But he has kept me in total ignorance, hence I do not know what to make of it.

H. G. VILJOEN.

University, Stellenbosch,
S. Africa.

THE READING IN ARISTOPHANES, ACH. 912.

ΔΙΚ. Καὶ μὴν ὁδὶ Νικαρχος ἐρχεται φανῶν 908
ΒΟΙ. μικρὸς γὰρ μάκος οὗτος. ΔΙΚ. ἀλλ' ἅπαν 909
κακόν.
ΔΙΚ. ταντὶ τίνας τὰ φορτὶ ἐστὶ; ΒΟΙ. τῷδ' ἐμὰ 910
θεῖβαθεν, ἔττω Δεός. ΔΙΚ. ἐγὼ τοίνυν ὁδὶ 911
φαίνω πολέμα ταῦτα. ΒΟΙ. τί δαὶ κακὸν 912
παθῶν
ὀρναπετίοισι πόλεμον ἦρα καὶ μάχαν.

In line 912, the reading of the MSS. is τί δαὶ κακὸν παθῶν. So Paley, who notes that Elmsley rejected κακόν as a gloss and read . . . ταυταγὶ. ΒΟΙ. τί

δαὶ παθών; κ.τ.λ. Bentley (followed by Meineke and Ribbeck) reads τί δὲ κακὸν παθών; Paley suggested καὶ τί κακόν, κ.τ.λ. But none of these changes accounts for the reading in the MSS.

The present writer suggests τί δ' ἄδικον παθών; the corruption would arise as follows:

ΤΙ Δ' ΑΔΙΚΟΝ > ΤΙ ΔΑΙΚΟΝ > ΤΙ ΔΑΙ ΚΑΚΟΝ, the syllable ΚΟΝ becoming ΚΑΚΟΝ under the influence of ΚΑΚΟΝ at the end of line 909, three lines above.

In support of this suggestion, it may be pointed out (1) That the Boeotian speaker, in his very next words, says τί ἄδικειμένος; (2) the Scholiast on line 912 says τί ἡδικημένος.

M. KEAN.

Collegiate School,
Liverpool.

EURIPIDES, *HECUBA*, 854-6.

εἴ πως φανείη γ' ὥστε σοὶ τ' ἔχειν καλῶς
στρατῶ τε μὴ δόξαιμι Κασάνδρας χάριν
Θρήκης ἀνακτι τὸνδε βουλευσάι φόνον.

THE meaning is clear: the speaker (Agamemnon) wishes to gratify Hecuba while safeguarding his own reputation. But the method of expression, as in the text, is confused, and the first τε (following σοὶ) is meaningless.

Parallel clauses depending on ὥστε are required, and these are obtained by reading δόξαι με in place of δόξαιμι.

J. M. SING.

HORACE, *SAT. I. IX.* 39-40.

'si me amas,' inquit, 'paulum huc ades.'
'Inteream si
Aut valeo stare, aut novi civilia iura.'

How is *stare* to be taken here? (The bore has been telling Horace that he had to attend court, and begs him to wait for him.) The traditional interpretations of *stare* in this passage make Horace say: (1) That he cannot appear as an advocate; or (2) that he cannot stand so long in court; or (3) that he cannot interrupt his walk.

With reference to (1), it may be pointed out that the bore, who has

evidently waylaid Horace in order to get an introduction to Maecenas (*vide* lines 45-47 of the *Satire*), would most likely know that the poet did not belong to the class of advocate.

To take (2), who can tell how long any lawsuit is going to last? Has the bore actually appealed to Horace to enter the court with him? Has he not rather merely asked him to wait for him?

The third interpretation is somewhat more convincing, for Horace has already explained that he had a long distance to cover (*vide* line 18). Porph. says, 'Negat se posse eum exspectare.'

The interpretation now suggested is to take *stare* as meaning 'to be successful.' Horace knows the fellow is a defendant, and feeling a little sympathy he may be imagined to say: 'I swear by my life that I haven't a leg to stand on in a law court; in fact, I don't know a word about law.'

This use of *stare* is found in Horace, *Sat. I. x.* 17, and *Ep. II. i.* 176.

M. KEAN.

QUERIES TO ARTICLE ON PLAUT. *STICH.* 1 FF., CLASS. REV. SEPTEMBER, 1918.

'THE *a* of *vidua* was pronounced short in Plautus's time, as later, so that Synaphea is out of the question.' Is 'short' mistake for 'long' here? How can it be said that Synaphea is out of the question, when all four lines scan with Synaphea, '-ām fu-, -ām so-, -mō quae, viduā vi-, -ūit nam?' Synaphea is observed in every line quoted from this Canticum in this article.

Is Synaphea a mistake for *Symizesis*?

'Colon Reizianum, that favourite colon of Plautus.' Is it so frequent in Plautus? How many examples of it can be quoted from the whole of Plautus's plays all put together?

'Editors of Euripides call *Bacch.* 863 a Colon Reizianum. But surely it is a syncopated Pherecratean.' Colon Reizianum is the same thing as a syncopated Pherecratean

συμπύκτοισ | ἀναπαλοῖτοισ
qua[rum] | viri hinc ab[sunt].

'mūltā | vōlō tē|cūm . . .' Is the ā of *multa* an 'irrational' short standing in place of a long, or is this an example of neut. acc. plur. -ā sometimes found in early Latin verse, e.g. *omniā, graviā*?

The Colon Reizianum is equivalent to the ending of a Hexameter, sixth and fifth foot and part of the fourth,

4 5 6
qui | primus ab | oris
qua|rum viri hinc | absunt.

The versus Reizianus with Iamb. Dim. first half is similar to the Iambelegus:

tu vina Torquato move || consule | pressa me|o
(Pentameter ending)
quarumque nos negoti|is ab|sentum ita ut |
equomst (Hexameter ending)

except that, whereas the two halves of Iambelegus are διε]-εὐρμένα, the two halves of versus Reizianus are dove-tailed, συνημμένα, the last long syllable of Iamb. Dim. being also the first long syllable of fourth foot of Hexameter.

[Why is 'ita ut equomst' spelled with ē, but 'nos facere aequomst' spelled with ae-?]

The anacrusis of the Colon Reizianum may be either ∪ ∪ -, - -, or ∪ -, or ? - ∪ multā? i.e. either four morae or three. With any of these, except - ∪, the Colon Reizianum = end of a hexameter

4 5 6
∪ ∪ | - ∪ ∪ | - -
- | - ∪ ∪ | - -
∪ | - ∪ ∪ | - -

but - ∪ | ∪ ∪ - | - will not fit the fourth and fifth foot of the hexameter. Therefore 'mūltā volo tecum' is more probable.

sōrōr sumu'	{	but {	sed hoc sōrōr cruci or
sem per			And in Middleton and Mills, <i>Companion to Latin Authors, Stichus</i> 18 is scanned:—
sed hic sōrōr	{	{	haec rēs vitae me sōrōr
adsidedum			saturant.

In view of old Lat. *melior*, and 'stultiōr es barbaro Poticio,' etc., it is difficult to believe that *soror* was here pronounced -ōr; and the proceleusmatic ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ that results is unlikely in either line, especially in the second half of anapaestic dimeter

haec res vitae || me s'rōr | saturant
sounds better.

NO. CCLXXIII. VOL. XXXIII.

So in *Stichus* 26

ūt 'stūc | faciat | quod tu | metius
is more likely than 'ut īstūc|.'

facit in jūriās | immerito.

The -ās, acc. plur., is not easily swallowed. Why not synizesis 'in jūriās|'?

'āde(o) ū|nīcē q(ui) ū|nus' is still more indigestible. Fennell's edition, 1893, reads 'ādeo qui unus ūnice.' Was the real original 'ādeo unus qui unus'? 'unu' qui 'unus' like 'an qui amant' (V. *Ecl.* 8, 108).

E. J. BROOKS.

AUGUSTUS.

I VENTURED lately to suggest in the *Journal of Roman Studies*, that the name Augustus, given to Octavian in 27 B.C., might have been suggested by the abbreviation *Aug.* for *Augur* on coins of Octavian's late rival, Mark Antony, which coins must have been in fairly common circulation in or just before 27 B.C. My idea was that the name Augustus, abbreviated to *Aug.*, would thus automatically absorb the description of Antony on these coins, in a manner very characteristic of the statecraft of Octavian. In the latest number of the *Classical Review* (Nov.-Dec., 1918, p. 158), Miss L. R. Taylor, of Rome, finds this theory improbable, particularly because the abbreviation *Aug.* for Augustus, while common in later times, first occurs on coins of 19 B.C., but on early coins and early inscriptions the name is written in full. Miss Taylor adds that she prefers a view of Mr. Warde Fowler, that in *Aen.* VII. (sic) 678 'hinc augustus agens Italos in proelia Cæsar', the word *augustus* should be read as an epithet, not as a proper name. It is thought that the account of Actium, to which this line belongs, may have been written as a separate poem soon after the battle, and that the line quoted may indicate a certain enlargement in the figure of Augustus, on the shield of Aeneas.

I do not wish to argue the point, which, indeed, is far too mixed up with conjectures to be capable of proof. It depends on a string of guesses which

E

are not unattractive individually, nor perhaps singly, unlikely, but for which positive evidence is altogether wanting. I might, of course, observe that Miss Taylor throughout quotes the wrong book of the *Aeneid*—VII., instead of VIII. But the argument is not affected by that slip. I am more concerned to suggest that her demurrer, in respect of the date of the abbreviation, is a little over-strained. Naturally the abbreviation Aug. would not be so common for Augustus in the first few years after 27 B.C. as it would be rather later on. But its occurrence (and not once only) in the monumentum Anc., which I noted, is sufficient proof that it was not an impossible or altogether unfamiliar abbreviation in the Augustan age, and the argument that it does not occur on coins till 19 B.C. appears to me by no means to prove that it could not be or was unlikely to be used about 27 B.C. I do not think that kind of chronological argument is really permissible. If the abbreviation Aug. never occurred elsewhere in the Augustan period, it would be a different matter. But Miss Taylor's rigid time-test appears to go too far for the intelligent dating of Roman inscriptions on coins or stones. It is not as if the abbreviation Aug. were absolutely unique in the period about 19 B.C. As anyone can see who looks; e.g., at Cohen, it occurs several times on the legends of coins minted between 19 B.C. and 10 B.C. Moreover, that Octavian had an eye on the title *Augur* used by Antony is indicated by a coin of 27 B.C., in which he calls himself *Augur*.

I will conclude with the observation that if, in *Aen.* VIII. 678, *Augustus* is to be interpreted as denoting that the shield of Aeneas showed the figure of Augustus disproportionately large, Virgil expressed himself more obscurely and briefly than is his wont. But here one passes into the region of opinion, where direct proof ceases to be possible.

F. HAVERFIELD.

MANDALUS. RECUA. MALACRUCIA.

My contributions to the last number (C.R. XXXIII. 26) were unlucky. *Mandalus* of the Glossaries is merely a

Latin form of Greek *μάνδῦλος* and unsuitable for Martial XIV. xxix. 2. *Recula* has been already suggested in the Paravia text of *Moretum* (line 65). As regards the *malacrucia* of the MSS. of Plautus at *Cas.* 416, it may be mentioned that *Pers.* 574 shows that *mala crux* was not the invariable phrase:

I sis [in] malū cruciatum. I sane tu—hanc eme; ausculta mihi.

W. M. LINDSAY.

CICERO, PRO RAB. POST. 7. 17.

IN stating the equestrian case against a proposed law to make the order liable to the charge of judicial corruption, which, first by a *lex Sempronia* and later by a *lex Cornelia*, had fallen only on the senatorial or official class, Cicero introduces an imaginary dialogue between a senator and an *eques*. 'Tam es tu iudex [eques] quam ego senator,' says the former. 'Ita est,' retorts the latter, 'sed tu istud petisti, ego hoc cogor. Qua re aut iudici mihi non esse liceat, aut lege senatoria non teneri.' I do not raise the question here whether this dialogue fits the situation in 91 B.C., to which Cicero refers it, or whether, as seems to me more probable, it is a reminiscence of his own advocacy against the well-known proposal of Cato in 60 B.C. I am only concerned with the antithesis between '*istud*' and '*hoc*.' There are, I find, scholars who authoritatively declare that '*istud*' can only mean 'to be a senator,' and '*hoc*' 'to be a *iudex*.' Surely this distorts or destroys the antithesis, misses the point of the argument and leaves '*cogor*' unexplained. If the senator had said 'you are as much a *iudex* as I am a senator,' no doubt '*istud*' and '*hoc*' would have the meanings suggested above. But what he says is, 'you, being an *eques*, are as much a *iudex* as I am, being a senator.' The subject of discussion therefore, to which both '*istud*' and '*hoc*' must be referred, is not the fact of being a senator, or the fact of being an *eques*, but solely the fact or condition of being a *iudex*. The senator's point is that this is common to himself and the *eques*.

That of the *equus* is that there is an antithesis between the senator's position as *index* and his own. '*Istud*' therefore means 'your position as senatorial *index*;' '*hoc*' means 'my position as equestrian *index*.' '*Petisti*' and '*cogor*' then explain themselves. Senators, in spite of their liability to the *lex Sempronia*, had eagerly sought the position between 122 and 81 B.C. *Equites* had of course also desired the position, but both in 91 and 60 B.C. they were confronted with compulsory liability to a charge from which they had so far been exempt. Is there a flaw, which I do not detect, in this interpretation, either in respect of Latinity or logic? Of course the equestrian point, whether made by Cicero or the *equites* themselves, is sophistical, but that is another matter.

E. G. HARDY.

VIRGIL, ECLOGUE IV. 60 FF.

THE following passage, which has just been sent me by a friend, may throw some light on the much disputed question whether the smile in the last four lines of Virgil's fourth eclogue is that of the infant or the mother. It comes from *Sketches of the Rites and Customs of the Greco-Russian Church*, by H. C. Romanoff, p. 8 (Rivingtons, 1868), with an introduction by Charlotte Yonge, who tells us that the writer was an English lady married to a Russian officer stationed in a remote province.

'Román thrave beautifully; his first smile and first tear, which are considered by the Russians as harbingers of reason in an infant, were quite epochs in the family history, so much was said about them.'

W. WARDE FOWLER.

'MULE NIHIL SENTIS' (CATULLUS, 88, 3).

WHY does Catullus call Lesbia's husband a mule? '*Quia nihil sentiebat*,' say some. But nowhere in Latin is *mulus* used as a synonym for *ἀνίσθητος*. At Juvenal 16, 23, *mulino corde Vagelli*,

Mayor supports the reading *mulino* (against the *Mutinensi* of the majority of MSS. by a reference to Plautus, *Cist.* 4. 12, 2. So does Friedlaender, and so does Ellis on this passage of Catullus. One may edit a classical author and yet keep a light conscience—for the phrase *mulo inscitior* occurs nowhere in Plautus (whose plays, incidentally, rarely contain twelve Scenes to the Act), though it is alleged to do so by Forcellini's Lexicon.

Others would have it that Catullus calls Lesbia's husband a mule '*sterilitatis causa*.' The union with Lesbia is said to have been a childless one. But it is difficult to find any pertinence in an allusion here to this misfortune.

Umpfenbach, cited by Ellis, would read, with the MSS., '*Mulle*'—understanding an allusion to the acute hearing of mullets, a fact of natural history not more familiar, we may suppose, to the average Roman of Catullus' time than it is to the average Englishman of our own.

Now, if Lesbia was Clodia, her husband was Q. Metellus Celer. The name Metellus was both a proper name and what the grammarians call a 'common' name. If we could find out what the common noun *metellus* means we should, perhaps, be in the way of discovering why Catullus called Metellus a mule. The word *metellus* occurs only in one passage in Latin literature. Festus preserves for us (p. 132, Lindsay) this line of Accius:

calones famulique metellique caculaeque (cauleque *codd.*).

calones and *caculae* are some kind of soldier-servant or groom. Festus understands *metelli* apparently in much the same sense—he renders it by *mercenarii*. But apart from Festus there is no authority for this explanation, and it obviously rests on an absurd etymology—Festus has derived *metellus* from *metallum*.

We must take the word in connexion with another rare and obscure word, *metella*. *Metella* also is a military word: meaning in Vegetius (*Mil.* 4, 6) a species of wooden basket (*de ligno crates*) employed in sieges: the besieged filled these baskets with stones and emptied them on the heads of the

besiegers. It is supposed that the word is the feminine of an adjective, some such noun as 'machina' *subauditur*. If this be correct *metellus* similarly should be an adjective; and it should naturally also have some connexion with baskets. I would conjecture that the substantive to be understood with *metellus* is *equus*. The 'basket-horse' will be a pack-horse, a military baggage-animal. I would then restore to Accius

calones mulique metellique caculaeque.

I can find no example of *famulus* in the sense of a military servant: it should naturally mean a household servant.

Accordingly, when Catullus wrote 'Mule, nihil sentis,' his friends knew very well that the 'mule' was the pack-horse, the *metellus*—just as at 79, 1, 'Lesbius est pulcher,' they readily took the allusion to 'Pulchellus.'

Metellus is, perhaps, like other pieces of Roman vocabulary in connexion with horses, carriages, etc.—*caballus*, *cantherius*, *essedum*, *petorritum*, *plexenum*—a foreign word. Such imported words are natural in the language of the camp.

H. W. GARROD.

VIRGIL, *AEN.* XII. 473. 519.

Nigra velut magnas domini cum divitis aedes pervolat et pinnis alta atria lustrat hirundo, pabula parva legens nidisque loquacibus escas, et nunc porticibus vacuis, nunc umida circum stagna volat.

DR. ROYDS tells us that, although to many Englishmen 'swallow' means anything from a swift to a sand-martin, Virgil probably distinguished the species. Thus 'hirundo' must be taken as a generic, not a specific, name. Until the days of Gilbert White the swift was generally believed to belong to the same genus as the swallow and the martin, and doubtless Virgil so classed it. In the passage quoted does not the poet mean the swift? He seems to mark this by the opening epithet, for the blackness has no part in the comparison with the movements of Juturna, while the swift on the wing appears to be black, and has none of the lighter feathers of the true hirundines. The movements described are precisely those

of the swift. I have seen swifts flying in this way over and round the piazza of Volterra, the flock dividing into three when it came to the medieval tower, and some flying on either side and some through the unglazed windows.

J. S.

Westminster.

POMPEY'S COMPROMISE:

CICERO, *AD FAM.* VIII. 11, 3.

HARDY, in his recent examination of 'Caesar's Legal Position in Gaul' (*Jour. of Phil.* XXXIV. 161-221) has disposed of the hypotheses of Hirschfeld (*Klio* IV. 76 ff.) and Judeich (*Rhein. Mus.* LXVIII. 1 ff.) and has proved quite conclusively that Caesar's term in Gaul extended to March 49 B.C. with the implied right of holding his command throughout the year 49. However, all the disputants have found difficulty in comprehending the purport of Pompey's offered compromise to permit Caesar the privilege of remaining till the Ides of November (*Ad Fam.* VIII. 11, 3). I would offer what seems to me a plausible explanation, which incidentally adds a point in favour of Hardy's contention. The passage in question is found in a letter of Caelius written to Cicero in April or May of 50 B.C., after Curio had foiled the attempt of the Pompeian party to abbreviate Caesar's term. The lines read: 'in quam adhuc incubuisse cum senatu Pompeius videtur ut Caesar Id. Nov. decedat; Curio omnia potius subire constituit quam id pati, . . . Scaena rei totius haec: Pompeius, tamquam Caesarem non impugnet sed quod illi aequum putet constituat, ait Curionem quaerere discordias, valde autem non vult et plane timet Caesarem cos. designat prius quam exercitum et provinciam tradiderit.'

The old explanation of Zumpt assumed that the Ides of November was the anniversary of the day on which the law was passed which gave Caesar his second quinquennium in Gaul, but Lange has shown that this was impossible since the day was a holiday on which laws could not be passed. Hirschfeld and Judeich, without attempting to explain the choice of the Ides of November, tried with little success to show that the year

50 B.C. was referred to; Holzapfel (*Klio* V. 113) rightly refers the proposed date to the year 49, but fails to show how the offer could in anyway be called *aequum* to Caesar. Hardy (*loc. cit.* p. 208) says 'Why this date was chosen is not clear.'

Since Pompey's proposal was, according to Caelius, an offer that pretended to be fair to Caesar, Pompey apparently undertook to prove that it gave Caesar his legal term in the province. His offer therefore probably contained a clause which was to restore in February of 49 the forty-five days that the calendar had lost by two previous failures to insert intercalary months, for if these were restored *there would be exactly 365 days in the year 49 before the Ides of November*. It is apparently on the basis of such a clause that Pompey could claim that his offer was fair to Caesar. The reason why this and other details did not appear in the letter of Caelius is that complete copies of the bills and speeches accompanied the letter (*Ad Fam.* VIII. 11, 4).

Curio refused to accept the compromise, since it would expose Caesar to legal action for six weeks. Indeed, as Caelius well comprehended, Pompey had

offered it merely for the purpose of making an impression of moderation. Ultimately he had no intention of permitting Caesar to stand for the consulship *in absentia*. Unfortunately for him, his pretence of moderation only weakened his supporters, and when the real test of strength came a few days later the senate refused to challenge Caesar's claims (*Ad Fam.* VIII. 13, 2).

If this is the solution of the difficulty, the offer must apply to the year 49, for it was made in April or May of the year 50, and there could hardly be a question of intercalation before February of 49. Hardy's contention that Caesar had a legal right to his province throughout 49 is therefore supported by this passage. Let me add that in Cicero's answer (*Ad Fam.* II. 15, 3) to this letter from Caelius: 'Faveo Curioni, Caesarem honestum esse cupio,' we should probably read *honestatum* for *honestum*, for in the light of *Ad Fam.* VIII. 11, 3, the second clause seems to be explicative. Cicero's answer seems to mean: I support Curio's contention, and I wish Caesar to win his consulship.

TENNEY FRANK.

Bryn Mawr College.

REVIEWS

MISS MATTHAEI ON TRAGEDY.

Studies in Greek Tragedy. By LOUISE M. MATTHAEI. Demy 8vo. Pp. xii + 226. Cambridge: University Press. Price 9s. net.

THIS book is written with enthusiasm and sincerity. That is its great merit; and, although the style is somewhat laborious, so that the book is not very easy to read, the effort is worth making, because it is always worth while to listen to a serious person talking honestly about Greek tragedy. Miss Matthaei never makes the mistake, into which some professors, who would be edifying, fall, of condescending to the ancient poets; nor does she follow the bad custom of making Aeschylus and Euripides the excuse for a cheap display of ingenuity. Such

originality as her book claims, is the result of an honest attempt to understand her authors, to report what she finds in them, not to use them as a peg on which to hang some new and brilliant theory of her own.

Therefore, her book is worth reading. But I must be honest myself, and must admit that, with all its sincerity, and although it bears the evident traces of careful, independent thinking, it seems to me to suffer from a grave defect of method. She tells us she has simply taken four plays which interested her, and has tried to show by analysing them 'what are the qualities which make the Tragic Spirit.' I wish she had been content to show the qualities which make the four plays interesting to her. That is

the first and most important thing to do. If you set out to discover 'the qualities which make the Tragic Spirit,' you may fall into dangerous assumptions, by which Miss Matthaëi is not the first critic, and will not be the last, to be misled. You may be hypnotised by the thought that 'there are definite general principles' which underlie the plays you happen to be analysing, and, 'indeed every true example of the tragic art.' In demonstrating that the play which interests you conforms in fact to some arbitrary definition of 'the tragic art,' you may read into it some tendency or purpose which neither the poet nor his audience (nor you yourself, when first you found his work worth analysing) had in mind. Explain exactly why the play seems interesting, and you may perhaps contribute something to the body of evidence which will some day be considered by the philosopher who shall find leisure, and sufficient abstraction from more pressing and more valuable pursuits, to propound a theory of 'the tragic.' But read your play with the object and intention of defining tragedy, and you will probably find that you have missed, or, at any rate, misrepresented, the very qualities which first attracted you to your play. Like Aristotle, Miss Matthaëi is tempted by the prospect of a definition. She is at her best when she contrives to forget her search for the Tragic Spirit, and has leisure to explain the drama of Aeschylus or of Euripides. And, indeed, her search is itself no such free adventure as she seems to think. When she tells us, at the outset, that 'every true tragedy turns on a conflict,' we hang a little on the word 'true,' and suspect that we shall meet the names of Hegel and of Bradley in her argument. And, sure enough, we are to hear in due course that every tragedy turns not only on a conflict whether of principle or of persons, but also on a conflict in which each of the opposing forces is compounded duly of evil and of good. Tragedy is a conflict, not between black and black, black and white, white and white (which would doubtless be impossible), but always, if it be 'true tragedy,' between black and white and white and black. It seems so helpful, and it fits in so well with a particular sort of cheerfulness about the uni-

verse. It is not surprising that many honest readers are content to let Hegel and his followers confuse their minds. But the doctrine, which is harmless enough when you apply it to the *Prometheus*, and which does little more than introduce a note of vagueness in our author's treatment of the *Hippolytus*, has disastrous results when we try to foist it on to an appreciation of the *Ion* or the *Hecuba*. With Miss Matthaëi's elucidation of the *Prometheus* I have no quarrel. Her conception of a progressive Zeus, who, like his victims, has something to learn, and ultimately learns it, I believe to be in conformity with the ideas of Aeschylus. Her interpretation, though it is not altogether new, is, I think, a valuable contribution to the study of a play whose theology is a test, and a stumbling-block, to many of the modern 'orthodox.' Her analysis of the *Hippolytus* is, on the whole, both just and sympathetic, with its appreciation of Phaedra, whose tragedy derives from an excess, not a defect, of a certain sort of modesty of mind. But her general theory of tragedy leads her, I venture to suggest, into serious, almost ridiculous, error, when it makes her treat Apollo, one of the tragic antagonists of the *Ion*, with an exaggerated metaphysical respect. Apollo, we are to understand, represents in that play not merely a disreputable aspect of popular mythology, but also, as by a mystery, the inscrutable element in circumstance, the tragic riddle which forms the background of all human life. Whither this sort of theorising leads us we realise, with something of a shock, when Miss Matthaëi gravely infers, from the obvious effectiveness of Ion's final insistence on an answer to the question of his parentage, that Euripides, you see, was not a determinist! Similarly, since the *Hecuba*, if it be a 'true' tragedy, must involve a conflict between two principles or persons, each of which is partly good and partly bad, we are seriously asked to believe that the sacrifice of Polyxena in that play stands for the tragic assertion of the good of the community, as overriding the good of the individual, while Hecuba's appalling treatment of Polyxena represents the tragic issue of the counter assertion of the injured individual's personal claim. The theory is not

so crudely stated; but that is essentially Miss Matthaei's view. I suggest that, if she had never theorised with Hegel and with Bradley, she might (as her appreciation both of Polyxena and of Hecuba seems to show) have given us a better interpretation of the tragedy. She is right in thinking that the play has unity of conception. She is right in thinking that the key to that unity is in the contrast between Polyxena, the willing victim, and Hecuba, the fury, turned, in the very moment of perfected vengeance, into a wild beast. But Euripides, I suggest, was not thinking of the conflict between 'the good of the community' and 'the good of the individual.' He was showing something more moving, more important. Whatever other human beings may inflict on Polyxena, they can not really hurt her spirit. Hecuba, who takes the way which most of us would take, can have her vengeance, it is true. She can torture her enemy, as he deserves,

we think, to be tortured. But the effect on herself is, that she loses her humanity; she becomes a beast.

The chapter on 'Accident' has the defects and the merits of the book. The tendency to look for generalisations, classifications, and a system, will probably attract some readers, because most English readers, though they would be surprised to be told it, really care a good deal more about philosophy than they do about art. For my own part, I find it difficult to believe that either Aristotle or his modern followers do much service to literature by laying down rules for artists or their critics. But here, as throughout the book, there is something attractive, if I may say it, something *digne*, about Miss Matthaei's work, which makes me want to treat it respectfully, even when I am most doubtful as to the direct assistance it will give me in the understanding of Greek tragedy.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

PLUTARCH'S LIVES.

Plutarch's Lives. With an English Translation by BERNADOTTE PERRIN. Vol. V. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. ix+544. London: Heinemann, 1917. 7s. 6d.

A TRANSLATOR of Plutarch's *Lives* has in many respects a happy task. His subject has long ago proved its power to attract and to charm a wider circle of men than any other classical writing. The warriors and statesmen, presented to us by the prince of biographers, appeal to common humanity in a way that philosophers or even poets can never do; and the public affairs in which they played their part bear continuous resemblance to the events of any and every age. The translator has therefore few dull pages to trouble him, and he can count upon readers who are predisposed to welcome his work. In the fifth volume of the Loeb Plutarch, now before us, there is a profusion of entertaining matter. Pompey, Marcellus, Agesilaus, and Pelopidas are all characters of strong human interest, as well as of historical importance. In the *Life of Pompey* we

are reminded of recent events by the menace of the pirate ships, which, like the elusive submarines of to-day, seriously hampered the commerce of the Mediterranean and made food scarce at Rome. When Pompey was appointed to the supreme command against the pirates, prices immediately fell, a fact which the populace duly appreciated. In the *Life of Marcellus* we read how Archimedes defended Syracuse with his wonderful military engines. This defence is described in the Greek with a vividness which almost makes us feel that the account came originally from the pen of some ancient war correspondent. Professor Perrin's translation at this point is a good piece of work, picturesque, clear, and vigorous.

In preparing his translation, Professor Perrin has consulted the previous English versions of the *Lives*, and as a rule to good effect. He writes fluently and naturally, and does not all the while suggest to us the scholar laboriously trying to keep in touch with his original. He can turn the Greek neatly into idiomatic English, and he avoids harsh and ill-sounding sentences. The

translation gives evidence of skill and care. Here is a fair specimen, taken from the *Life of Pompey*, ch. xxiii., p. 173:

For life in the robes of peace has a dangerous tendency to diminish the reputation of those whom war has made great and ill-suited for democratic equality. Such men claim that precedence in the city also which they have in the field, while those who achieve less distinction in the field feel it to be intolerable if in the city at any rate they have no advantage. Therefore when the people find a man active in the forum who has shone in camps and triumphs, they depress and humiliate him, but when he renounces and withdraws from such activity, they leave his military reputation and power untouched by their envy. How true this is, events themselves soon showed.

Given the space, one could take many such passages and show, by comparing them in detail with other translations, the advance that Professor Perrin has made upon his modern predecessors. Besides this, a grateful word is due from all lovers of Plutarch for the extreme convenience of this edition, which gives the Greek text and English version side by side, with many useful notes and cross-references, and a valuable index, containing in brief compass much information about the persons and places mentioned in the book. In these respects the Loeb Plutarch stands alone. What we miss in it, and in other modern versions too, is dignity. We are badly in need of a translation suited to the twentieth century, as North's was suited to the sixteenth. The language of such a translation must be the common speech of to-day, but it must not be commonplace. Dignity comes, partly at any rate, from the use of simple, direct utterance. If we say 'subsequently' for 'later' or 'afterwards' (p. 365), 'frequently' for 'often' (p. 475), 'dispatch' for 'kill' (p. 367), 'stationed himself' for 'took his stand' (*καταστάς*, p. 243), 'superiors' in a context where 'betters' would fit the sense (p. 401), 'assistants' (*ὑπηρέται*, p. 19) where 'underlings' would give just that touch of scorn which the passage demands, or if we use cumbrous phrases like 'under the circumstances' (p. 277), we take the edge off our speech. Dignity depends also upon the respect which the translator feels for his author. It

would be impertinent to say that modern translators of Plutarch do not respect him, but certainly their writing does not often glow with any warmth or enthusiasm. There is in Plutarch, heavy though his style may sometimes seem, an undercurrent of real eloquence which is part of the man's own kindly and earnest nature. Much of this eloquence may be lost if the translator is not alive to its presence, and does not value it and make an effort to reproduce it. North's great work, judged simply as a translation, would hardly be accepted by scholars to-day, in view of our strict notions of what a translation should be; but his spirit is worthy of all imitation. 'Now for the author,' he says in his preface, 'I will not deny but love may deceive me, for I must needs love him with whom I have taken so much pain.' Would not a little of North's frank admiration and affection put life and fire and dignity into the somewhat cold pages of our more scholarly versions?

Two other points may be mentioned. The use of the second person singular is usual with us in the scriptures and liturgical language, and also in poetry; but it is not our common speech, and no one nowadays uses it in prose. It would seem better, therefore, to avoid it in translation, except perhaps where there is danger of ambiguity. Professor Perrin is not consistent on this point, and any reader who compares for himself the spirited report of conversation on p. 239 or p. 461 with the stilted speech on p. 21 or p. 411 will judge which form is preferable. It is a great gain, too, if poetical quotations can be turned into verse. The effect of the original is needlessly lost if iambics or hexameters are reproduced in pseudo-verses which possess neither the irregular rhythm of prose (for they are made to stand apart from the surrounding prose) nor the regular rhythm of verse. This point may be thought small in itself, yet a translator who aims at a high standard of work cannot afford to neglect it.

The following misprints occur: p. 20, note, *Ἰδεῖν*, no accent or breathing; p. 68, *τοτε συνηγωνια*, no accents; p. 84, *χώρα* for *χώρα*; p. 172, *μέτ'* for *μετ*;

p. 175, Asclepias for Asclepius; p. 188, *Εκτορα*, no accent or breathing; p. 217, 'legitimate,' misspelled; p. 307, last

two lines, final letters wrong; p. 437, Marcu for Marcus.

G. W. BUTTERWORTH.

EUTHYMIDES AND HIS FELLOWS.

Euthymides and his Fellows. By JOSEPH CLARK HOPPIN. Octavo. Pp. xvi + 186, with 48 plates and 36 illustrations in the text. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917. \$4.00.

THE group of vase painters here described consists of Euthymides, the central figure, of Phintias, and 'Kleophrades,' in all probability his partner and pupil, and of Hypsis, whose relation is less easy to determine. To the student, usually condemned to search for the material he desires among numerous periodicals and repertories, the book will be indeed welcome; not only is it the first of its size to be sufficiently illustrated, but it contains also condensed and valuable information on most of the questions involved. To the expert it will afford pleasant matter for controversy; some thirty unsigned vases are attributed to the several painters, and various problems of the early R.F. period considered.

Dr. Hoppins' method is to discuss each artist in three sections: the signed vases are first given a description equivalent to that of a catalogue; the evidence they afford is then summed up and the individual peculiarities of drawing minutely analysed; thereby the reader is taken into the author's confidence, and can watch how the evidence is applied in the final section which deals with the attributed vases.

Euthymides is treated somewhat more fully than in the earlier monograph. Emphasis is laid on his consistent use of the proportion 1 : 7 for head and body, and the comments he inscribed on his own pots are pleasantly characterised as an ancient attempt at advertisement. Ten vases and fragments are assigned to him in addition to the original ten; these include the Vienna pelike with the murder of Aegisthos (after Furtwängler) and three small kylikes, attributed by Hartwig to Phintias, one at Athens bearing the signature *Φιντίας*

ἐποίησεν. If the hand that painted it was really that of Euthymides, not only would his partnership with Phintias be attested by inscriptional evidence, but he would appear in a new light as one of the more skilful of cup painters. Was he capable of a pose so free from awkwardness and a composition so ingenious? Unfortunately the Bocchi plate, which might have guided us, survives only in fragments.

Phintias is considered to be 'inferior in technical skill,' but 'possessing the elements of a bigger style.' It would appear that his development was arrested by the good fortune that placed him at the head of an atelier. The fact that his drawing became stereotyped, though regrettable from an artistic point of view, makes reconstruction of his work on the lines of this book most satisfactory. With Hypsis it is otherwise. His work is, on the whole, individual, and his people like demure children with big heads and feet, but its details are more elusive. Therefore the attribution of the Amphora B.M. E. 253, on the strength of its details and without regard to the general impression, is unconvincing. From the productions of the Kleophrades painter are selected six, illustrating Euthymides' influence.

The author does not purpose to speak much of the relation between Euthymides' circle and its contemporaries, apart from the rivalry with Euphronios and a suggested connexion between it and the "Andokides" group. This connexion is cited in favour of the theory that the four painted in B.F. technique: nevertheless, except in the case of Phintias' early kylix, their style shows too great an advance on that of Andokides to allow any resemblance to be used as proof. With reference to Andokides, is not the heterogeneous nature of his wares too much emphasised?

In the preface is mentioned the

impossibility of discussing the work of Euthymides apart from that of his colleagues. This is not only because they are allied in style, but because several of the unsigned vases are believed to be by two painters. Collaboration of this kind has been advocated by various scholars, but one has the impression that it is too often appealed to, and that the appeal is the outcome of insisting too strictly on uniformity of drawing. That the back or shoulder of a vase should be left to a subordinate is quite probable, in the case of an equal the process would have little to recommend itself, and neither a kylix of the 'Kleinmeister' type nor the British Museum Pamphaios kylix amounts to evidence.

One cannot be too grateful for the various tables and résumés the book contains. The analyses of composition by a scheme of essential lines are an interesting experiment, though naturally they neglect what is an equally good criterion, the spaces. Apart from the value of the illustrations in relation to the text, they are illuminating as a collection of works entirely of one period.

For a long time the science of vases has needed more books to come between the monograph on the one hand and the monumental folio on the other. Just such a book is *Euthymides and his Fellows*: it would be well if other painters could be chronicled in the same way.

W. LAMB.

A HISTORY OF GREEK ECONOMIC THOUGHT.

A History of Greek Economic Thought. By ALBERT AUGUSTUS TREVER. One vol. 9½" x 6½". Pp. 162. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1916. 3s. 6d. net.

THIS book is a dissertation submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Chicago University. It is planned as a history of the theoretical views entertained by those of the Greeks—philosophers for the most part—who have attempted a scientific investigation of economic subjects. It excludes, therefore, the history of Greek economic conditions, even where these may be regarded as the expression of a settled conviction. Three-fifths of the book are properly devoted to Plato and Aristotle, the only considerable authorities for whose beliefs information in sufficient detail is forthcoming. The remainder, apart from the introductory and concluding chapters, discusses pre-Platonic thought, Xenophon, the Orators, and the minor Socratics and post-Aristotelians—the two last being somewhat inconveniently grouped together under the description of 'Minor Philosophers.' It is, I think, unfortunate that, in the case of Xenophon, no attempt has been made to distinguish the views of Xenophon himself, chiefly contained

in the minor treatise on *Ways and Means* (πρόποι), from the opinions of Socrates, for which, in this sphere at any rate, Xenophon is our main source. The consequence is that, though there are many references to the Socratic point of view, what Socrates himself maintained is nowhere explicitly set forth. Some estimate of Socrates' contribution should have been formed; and, if the Cynic and Cyrenaic outgrowths had been examined in the same connexion, a clearer light would have been thrown on Plato's own development.

The chapters devoted to Plato and Aristotle are written clearly and carefully, and provide a useful compendium of the economic principles which are discussed or adopted by these writers.¹ Several of the passages which Mr. Trever examines have been vigorously debated by previous critics, and, even though his conclusions may not be accepted in every case, his arguments are presented with fairness and moderation.

The exposition of the thought of the earliest and latest periods is less satisfactory, and seems to have been written

¹ An error on p. 38 arises from the omission of *ἐνερκα* in the quotation from *Rep.* 371 B; and on p. 39, *Laws* 918 B is very imperfectly cited.

with the object of rounding off the central portion of the book.¹ Mr. Trever has pointed out that economic science was not developed by the Greeks as an independent branch of knowledge; and he is aware that it is seldom justifiable to read an economic significance into popular maxims or the fragmentary sayings of philosophers. Nevertheless, he has sometimes included matter which would have been more in place in the companion volume on economic conditions which he has promised to undertake. Scattered quotations, bearing on wealth or labour, from poets such as Hesiod, Theognis, and Euripides, are not of much value, unless the character and purpose of the writings in which they occur are carefully explained. Similar considerations apply to the philosophical schools. The statement (p. 132) that Antisthenes, 'though despising wealth, upheld the dignity of free labour,' is altogether misleading. It is based on Diog. Laert. VI. 2, which is a good instance of Cynic paradox. Inasmuch as no one doubted that grinding labour (πόνος) was an evil thing, it was a disturbing message to learn that the greatest of the Greek heroes proved the contrary by his habitual selection of discomfort

¹ The inference is suggested by the character of Chaps. III. and VI. as compared with the rest of the book. On p. 77 there is a reference to the chapter on Aristotle as having been already written.

in preference to ease. The treatment of the Stoics is equally inadequate. It is impossible to understand their position without some reference to the theory of *ἀξία*, the supremacy of *ἀρετή*, and the range of the *καθήκοντα* in correspondence with the various *ἀδιάφορα*. There are also some positive errors, such as the fixing of Zeno's birth in the year 320 B.C., and the assertion that he 'eulogised poverty,' which is based on a misapplication of Cic. *Fin.* V. 84 (p. 139, nn. 8, 10).

By his frank confession of possible errors the author goes far to disarm criticism. It must, nevertheless, be stated that the formal defects of the book are serious. The misprints, especially in the Greek quotations, are too numerous to mention. Other mistakes, such as 'Dichaearchus,' 'Hippodamas of Miletus,' 'Isomachus' (for Ischomachus), 'Thucydides Mythhistoricus,' 'Plato's Politics' (for *Politicus*), suggest by their repetition that the printer is not alone to blame. The system of cross-reference is loose, as in the constantly recurring 'cf. *infra*,' and often inaccurate (e.g. p. 17, n. 1; p. 79, n. 4). Several of the quotations are carelessly made, and, as they stand, are misleading or unintelligible. Besides those already mentioned, examples occur at p. 15, nn. 7, 12; p. 132, n. 2; and p. 141, n. 12. It is obvious that the book required a more searching revision than it has received.

A. C. PEARSON.

GAETANO DE SANCTIS: *STORIA DEI ROMANI*.

Storia dei Romani. Vol. III.: *L'Età delle Guerre Puniche*. By GAETANO DE SANCTIS. One vol. in two parts. 8vo. grande. Part I. xiii+432; Part II. viii+728, with 8 maps and plans of battles. Turin: Fratelli Bocca, 1916 and 1917. Lire 30 for the two parts.

IN 1908 Dr. H. Peter, reviewing with respectful admiration in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* the first two volumes of Professor De Sanctis' *Storia dei Romani*, doubted whether the author could continue his work on the vast scale of its early stages. It seems a

novelty to find a German critic quailing before the magnitude of a learned work, but if the present instalment of the *Storia* has reached Dr. Peter, he must feel reassured concerning the staying power of Professor De Sanctis. Over 1,150 pages are devoted to the First and Second Punic wars, and of the letterpress a good half is in the small print of notes and appendices, revealing a study of astonishing minuteness and precision, which takes account of the period in every aspect, military, political, antiquarian, topographical, and chronological, and is perhaps above all valuable for its most searching

analysis of the sources. But Professor De Sanctis is never one of those who fail to see the wood for the trees. His narrative is of a rare freshness. If all the notes and critical matter were taken out and published separately for the use of students, probably no Roman history in existence is so likely as this to rouse and hold the interest of the general reader, leading him with a sure hand through the details of campaigns and Roman politics. The author in his preface shows a certain anxiety lest those who do not know his other work should think him inclined to tell a tale rather than to trace and estimate religious, intellectual, or economic movements, and explains that war was the predominant element in the life of third-century Italians, so that the main business of their historian is to relate their wars; but wherever Professor De Sanctis finds occasion to summarise large tendencies, he does so with a masterly touch, and with a conciseness altogether admirable.

The book opens with a clear and very interesting account of the Carthaginian republic, its origin, the geography of its territory, its constitution, and civilisation, with a full discussion of the ethnology of North Africa and the relations existing between Carthage and the tribes subject to her, as well as her connexion with the mother city of Tyre and the growth of her hegemony over the other Phoenician colonies in the west. In one of the 'Statistical Notes' which form part of his first Appendix (I. p. 87), Professor De Sanctis, attempting to calculate the population of the Libyo-Phoenician cities, rebukes Beloch and others, who seek 'to belittle the importance of the Punic wars, declaring that the Phoenicians in Africa were too few ever to have succeeded in making the west a Semitic region. They were certainly not less numerous than the Latins, who for their part knew how to Latinise the country. The difficulty of assimilating the natives lay, not in the numbers of the Phoenicians, but, if anywhere, in their self-regarding attitude of isolation among their subjects. In this respect Phoenician imperialism differed from Roman, and was more akin to Anglo-Saxon rule, which has often been wrongly compared

to that of Rome. But we cannot say that this isolation would have lasted for ever, if conditions had changed.'

After this sketch of the origin and growth of Carthage the history goes straight to the opening of the first Punic war. The gravity of the Roman decision to intervene at Messina is very well brought out. No one in Rome foresaw the winning of sea-power, the conquest of Sicily and thereafter of the world, or the terrible struggle in store for the city. 'Perhaps many of those who gave their vote would have been disposed to withhold it, had a clear vision of the future been before them.' But in any case 'war between Carthage and Rome was inevitable. . . . Only if the Italian federation had allowed itself to be permeated by Greek culture, and if the progress of industry and commerce had made it less ready to take up arms could a way have been found for the peaceful existence of the two western powers side by side, and for Mediterranean civilisation to develop on a basis of reciprocal balance between a few large states, differing in nationality but similar in culture' (I. p. 101). Two moments, one at the beginning of the first Punic war, the other before the battle of Zama (which Professor De Sanctis bids us call Narragara, though force of habit is once too strong even for him, and in the *errata* we find, 'p. 555, for Zama read Narragara'), are selected as turning Rome irrevocably into the pathway of imperialism. The first was when M. Valerius resolved to march against Syracuse, thereby starting Rome on a career of conquest, whereas her previous wars for the unity of Italy had been 'defensively-offensive' (I. p. 114); the second incident was Scipio's rejection of the peace proposals of Syphax in 204, 'one of those occasions which mark out a nation's inevitable course, without contemporaries or perhaps even the principal actors being aware of what they were doing' (II. p. 526). 'Would Rome,' asks the author at the end of the book (II. p. 560) 'have the strength to resist temptation? Would she be able to take up once more a sober and quiet life, and put a curb on the militarism which was flourishing after seventeen years of warfare? The immediate future of Italy

and civilisation depended on the answer to such questions. And the answer had already been virtually given by the advance of M. Valerius beyond Messina, and of P. Scipio beyond the Castra Cornelia.'

In other passages the author seems to credit the Roman capitalist and Junker class with an excessive clearheadedness in their imperialistic aims. It may be doubted whether in the year 241 even 'the most hide-bound capitalists' welcomed peace because they perceived the necessity of 'husbanding the robust class of Italian peasants,' if they were to have armies wherewith to achieve foreign dominion (I. p. 195). If, in the author's opinion, the first steps towards empire were taken unconsciously, it only needed the first Punic war, the Roman request to Seleucus Callinicus on behalf of their kinsmen the people of Ilium, and their diplomatic intervention on the Acarnanian question, to create a full-blown spirit of unlimited aggression in the east (I. p. 278). But in general the moderation and well-balanced character of his judgement is remarkable; at the same time he never fails to come to a definite conclusion, after reviewing apparently the whole of the literature, ancient and modern, on the several points with which he deals. To confute him would require in almost every case a learning equal to his own. There can be very little in any of the chief European languages relevant to his purpose that has escaped his watchful eye. He cites articles in English and American periodicals constantly, but is possibly unfair to larger consecutive English works, such as those of Freeman, Bevan, or Heitland, in comparison with the notice accorded to the corresponding output of France and Germany.

A very important essay on the composition and structure of Polybius, which Professor De Sanctis rightly considers indispensable for the understanding of his observations on the sources and chronology of both Punic wars, is found at the end of I. chap. iii. The final summary of his critical work on all the sources (continued systematically at each stage of the book) is that, except where traces can be found of the earliest annalists, 'very little is trustworthy

that does not come to us directly or indirectly from Polybius. This proves that, however ruinous and reprehensible "polibiolatria" may be, there is no less danger in criticism which places and discusses on the same level contradictory passages of Livy and Polybius, or worse, of Polybius and Appian or Cornelius Nepos. Anyone who has formed a clear idea of the stuff that the younger contemporaries of Polybius put forward in Rome as history, may discuss and criticise Polybius, but cannot fail to respect him as a historian' (II. p. 671). Towards Livy's 'buon gusto' and 'buon senso' the author is affectionate (II. p. 656), but while full of sympathy for his tendency to 'live over again in the past the drama of his own age, with profound sincerity' (II. p. 194), and making every allowance for the difficulties in his way, he shows no mercy for the shallowness of Livy in research and his other infirmities. Polybius also comes in on occasion for censure, as 'his thought is frequently quite the reverse of profound, but this lack of profundity does not permit us to introduce arbitrary corrections into his text' (II. p. 147), after the manner of various modern scholars. With the 'perversity' (*secentismo*) of Laqueur and other textual and higher critics Professor De Sanctis has little patience, though ready enough to accept reasonable emendations and theories of second recensions; he describes the attitude of these writers as 'the tendency to substitute in investigation the idle play of ingenuity and the pursuit of novelty at all costs for the cautious and leisurely sifting of data' (II. p. 99). He considers that it would be useful to attempt a reconstruction of Caelius Antipater, in order to complete and verify previous analyses of sources, and thinks that the hypotheses put forward by him in the sixth Appendix to II. chap. vi. would form a starting-point for part of this work, although he does not wish to undertake it himself, and does not approve of the efforts of Wölfflin, O. Gilbert, and Sieglin in this direction.

The book contains careful studies of vexed questions, such as the reform of the *comitia*, the Roman calendar (which the author thinks was not very different

in the third century from the Julian calendar) and the topography of all the battles. The maps and plans are excellent in their clearness. Two slips not in the short list of *errata* are (1) I. p. 219 'Ol. 104, 1' where 140 should be read, and (2) II. p. 465 : Cartagena is not on the 'sponda occidentale' of Spain. Others can hardly fail to lurk in a work of so great a size, but they do not obtrude themselves. The index

has been tested and not found wanting. There is a clear and detailed chronological *conspectus*, and but one *desideratum* seems lacking—namely, a bibliography of the modern authors cited. Italy should receive the highest congratulations on herself producing a memorial of her national story, which is complete and complex without degenerating into lengthiness.

ADELA MARION ADAM.

CATALOGUE OF ARRETINE POTTERY IN THE MUSEUM OF FINE ARTS, BOSTON.

Catalogue of Arretine Pottery in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. By Professor GEORGE H. CHASE, Ph.D. Quarto. Pp. xii + 112, with thirty plates and two figures. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916. \$10.

CONSIDERING that there exist so few Catalogues of Roman and Arretine Pottery, it is pleasant that their quality should exceed their quantity. In 1908 the Loeb Catalogue appeared, a pioneer so splendid that one expected it would be unique; nevertheless the book under discussion, by the same author, and indebted in a large measure to Mr. Loeb's generosity, is on an almost equally sumptuous scale. Since the publication of the Loeb and British Museum Collections little has been added to our knowledge of these wares beyond articles on some isolated examples and an inaccessible German treatise: we have here an accession of valuable material, partly new, partly familiar, and all the more welcome because, of the Arezzo Collection itself no catalogue is as yet in existence.

The method differs very slightly from that adopted in the author's earlier work. The classification is according to subject, moulds and vases being described in the same section, and accompanied by very illuminating notes on artistic parallels, questions of epigraphy, etc. An entertaining feature of Arretine Pottery is the way in which the ingenious potter by permutations and combinations, achieved a variety of designs from a limited number of stamps. Dr. Chase

makes a point of this in the Introduction, and, when describing the vases, points out and letters those that occur more than once. As the types are so important in the case of figures, it would have been interesting to add a list of the ones in this collection, both for future reference and for comparison with the original list of Dragendorff. But the book includes no form of index, a fact inconvenient in a catalogue as full of information as this, and regrettable from the point of view of catalogues yet to be written.

On the other hand the reader, accustomed to emulate Oliver Twist where illustrations of archaeological books are concerned, has here no excuse for so doing: the thirty plates are beautiful in themselves, and reproduce, often more than once, the principal pieces in the collection.

Including vases, fragments, and miscellaneous objects, the collection comprises 143 items. There are many excellent and almost complete examples of the more common types; others which have a special point of interest, as the mould No. 1, with Nike, Artemis, and Apollo (the Greek names seem in spite of certain protests to have stuck to the Roman potter's handiwork), which is the first instance in pottery of a subject familiar elsewhere; others again which appear to be unique, such as the well-known mould with the death of Phaethon by Bargates (No. 66) and the Egyptianising fragment (No. 62): there are none however which, like the 'Birth of Dionysos' in the Loeb Collection, reconstruct as whole scenes what had

previously been known by fragments only. The signatures belong to some nine different workshops, the largest proportion, of course, to that of M. Perennius: one inscription, RHITV PISA, is believed to occur for the first time on No. 60.

Our historical outlook has altered very little since Oxe's more rigorous system of dating was adopted, and since the supposed slave Tigranes was given the credit of being identical with M. Perennius himself. Hence the introduction to this, the Boston Catalogue, is a modification of that of the Loeb Catalogue. It contains a short history of the finds of Arretine Pottery and their chroniclers from the fifteenth century downwards; a description of the technical processes involved in making the

pots; an account of the potters represented in the collection, and some remarks upon the forms of art influencing and influenced by Arretine Pottery, with the suggestion that some of the Renaissance work should be included under the latter heading.

When one turns the pages of the book for the first time, noticing the uniform print and long paragraphs, one has the impression that it is a catalogue disguised as a treatise; closer inspection shows that is not only a catalogue, but, save for the question of indices already noted, a most businesslike one. Moreover, an account of this kind and of objects so dainty and attractive cannot fail to be a source of enjoyment as well as of information.

W. LAMB.

THE DESCENT OF MANUSCRIPTS.

The Descent of Manuscripts. By A. C. CLARK. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1918. 28s. net.

IN this country we are growing richer in works on palaeography, pure and applied, and textual emendators are acquiring a habit of appealing to its principles to justify their suggestions (which as likely as not they have reached by quite other processes); emendation by intuition, such as belonged to the Italian scholars praised by Ellis in his Commentary on Catullus, is not possible for us alien workers; it is for us painfully to acquire knowledge of the ways and habits of scriptoria under the guidance of a Lindsay or a Traube, to mark down the lurking ligature or the ensnaring i-altum, before we can hope to emend texts even plausibly, and even then, as Professor Housman reminds us, it is necessary to be a textual emendator. Most of the books, however, have dealt with minuscule scripts and only cursorily with majuscules; and yet it is about the dark days of majuscules that we have most to learn, for it was in this period that our texts seem to have suffered most loss—not from deliberate corrections (for that fiendish art was probably rare and little known before the eleventh century and still

rare then¹), but from accidental blunders, omissions, and misreadings, incorporations of marginal matter and such like; errors due to human frailty and stupidity rather than to human wickedness and bumptiousness.² It is really, though not intentionally and solely, on pre-Caroline days that Professor Clark's book throws much-required light; he shows us what we have to learn from the length of the line, the number of lines in a page or column, and in general the shape of the book and the past history of a text, so that in fancy we get appreciably back nearer to the author's own days.

'The general object,' says Professor Clark, 'of this book is to show how internal evidence furnished by MSS. can be utilised to cast light upon the filiation of *codices*, and in some cases upon the archetype from which they are derived; also to apply such knowledge to the criticism and emendation of the text.' This evidence of the MSS. themselves is obtained by omissions, when they

¹ P² in Livy's third decade is such an irresponsible, ignorant meddler who writes a self-satisfied 'recognobi' after each book, but it is a problem where he got his right corrections from, if they are his.

² Shipley's *Certain Sources of Corruptions in Latin MSS.* is a very useful guide for the passage from uncials to Caroline.

are of known length, and by repetitions (dittographies), and by transpositions; together they show, as a general rule, the length of a line, *i.e.* certain point in one line to the same or nearly the same point in a line below of the MS. copied; frequently there is a contributory cause, *viz.* *ὁμοιότης*; sometimes valuable evidence as to line-omission is obtained from supplements in the margin. When lines thus discovered vary in length they testify to the presence of more than one ancestor. In uncials, for instance, a two-columned form with 16 to 18 letters in the line is common; but some of the earliest majuscules, as the palimpsest of the *de Republica* fragments, average $10\frac{1}{2}$ letters; when omissions show a number of such lines, *i.e.* with $10\frac{1}{2}$ letters as a unit, they point to an ancestor of this kind. Of course, some omissions must be made by mere accidents, especially by a scribe with roving eyes; but the larger number of omissions—I would venture to say the vast majority of them—are due to the eye passing from one point to a corresponding point in another line. Not only a line or two but a column, a page, and even a quaternion can be calculated, as Professor Clark has done. But caution is necessary: 'it is only when we have a large number of facts all tending in the same direction that chance becomes unlikely or impossible.'

It may be said that this is a very interesting study for the leisured, but of what advantage is it for textual emendation? Apart from considerations mentioned above there are others: if a reading is found in one family of MSS. and absent from another family (or only found in the margin of one), this principle supplies a test for its genuineness, for, as Mr. Clark says, 'an interpolator would not have been so cunning as to conceal his inventions by a device intended to show that their omission was palaeographically possible.' For instance, I applied the principle to a case of transposition as we believe it to be in Liv. 4. 2, *reminiscerentur—amplioremque*, to see how the passage would stand the test in the matter of length; the number of letters concerned is 18×8 —a result surprisingly satisfactory, it would seem. Moreover, with the support of the prin-

ciple of the line, we have restored two passages to the text of Livy 6-10: one a passage which Gelenius found in his codex and is in part found in the margin of M; the second, or rather a second and a third which are quoted by grammarians; in both the fall from the text was natural, owing to *ὁμοιότης*.¹

Single lines, varying as they do in length, are however not so telling as long passages where the average comes in, and the longer passage in Bk. 4 is of greater value than the shorter ones, especially in the matter of transpositions, where these are necessary or suspected; the value of the principle appears below with reference to Livy and in this work in the chapter on the pseudo-Asconius.

Otto Rossbach (*Berl. Phil. Woch.*, October, 1916) has applied with happy results the method of the 18 lettered line to some readings of Spirensis in Livy's third decade; in fact, no textual critic can afford to ignore the leading principles of this book, whether he approves of them or not. He is hardly likely to command attention, unless he applies the principles or offers something better to account for his emendations. If he fills a gap, existent or supposed, in his text (for instance, in the manner of the late Moritz Mueller's 'free composition'), his labour will be lost, as being unsupported; if he makes a transposition, he must strengthen it scientifically. Furthermore, the value of the method appears in dealing with slight repetitions, with variants, doublets, and 'voces nihili,' that invade the texts; sometimes they are from lines above, sometimes from the margin, which very often or rather more frequently get into the wrong place, even into the wrong column. These are well known, but Professor Clark has done service by showing how this may have happened; he has treated these questions scientifically: instead of saying 'inserted from above,' or 'from the margin,' in the old slipshod way, he has shown exactly how this may have happened.² For instance, he shows how

¹ Cf. Preface to vol. 2 of Liv. 6-10, when it is published!

² In the Medicean of the first decade of Livy marginal supplements are often far above or below the right place; evidently the scribe found them in the margin with or without marks for reinsertion.

Cic. *Phil.* xiv. 13 appears after an interval of 951 letters at § 15, and how in Cic. *Phil.* ii. 106, a 'vox nihili' is due to a doublet in § 104 after an interval of 953 letters. Livian texts bear this out in various ways. A remarkable 'vox nihili' appears in the text of some MSS. in 7. 1. 8, *nemo sic*, which ultimately was fully developed into a complete sentence; *ut in pluribus*, 26. 48. 12, is another; of repetition of part of a word (for such it appears to me) I may quote 45. 2. 5; Vindob., our sole authority, goes back 51 letters to *paucorum* and repeats a mysterious *pauci* which puzzles editors; Vindob. seems to be copying a MSS. which resembled itself, a MS. containing 25-26 letters to the line.

Further, we can get an understanding as to what happened in making 'shorter texts'; this is illustrated by shorter texts of Horace, Demosthenes' *Midias*, and the Acts, and particularly Cic. *ad Fam.* vi. 9. 1-10. 6 on pp. 147-153. All this is worked out in detail with considerable patience and consummate skill: in the first three chapters omissions, omission marks, and marginalia are dealt with, which ought to be read by all who have even so much as handled an ancient text; this is followed by evidence from Primasius' Commentary on the Apocalypse; chapters 5-11 have, what we expect from Professor Clark, a masterly account of Ciceronian palimpsests, texts of various Ciceronian works, and Asconius—chapters dealing specially with the subject under review, which are packed full of exceedingly interesting and valuable matter, and giving incontrovertible testimony of the truth of the doctrines enunciated; chapters 12 and 13 treat of MSS. of Plato and the Paris MS. of Demosthenes. An 'Addenda' illustrating the various points from English (in addition to those given in chapter 1) and other MSS. will be interesting to students of English texts. Full Indexes complete the volume.

I have noticed only one misprint: on p. 264, Livy 31. 3 cannot be right, as Bk. 31 has nothing to do with Vindob.; tracing it to Heraeus, I find he has 'Ibid. 31. 3,' i.e. 26. 31. 3, but neither is it there.

It will perhaps be suitable to set

NO. CCLXXIII. VOL. XXXIII.

forth a number of examples of omission from Livian MSS. of the third decade.¹ The examples are taken at random and are not complete. In the second half of the decade, where we have the Spirensian tradition (called S here) as well as Puteanus, I have noticed among smaller omissions the following on the part of P (P has an average of 17 or 18 letters in his line, sometimes he falls to 14 or 15, sometimes, but rarely, rises to 20 or 21; he has incomplete lines, too, marking real or sham paragraphs):

	Letters omitted.
28. 14. 9 ne aperirent (δμ.)	11
28. 15. 2 die iure etiam (δμ.)	13
27. 7. 4 supplicationes	14
28. 23. 4 ab tergo in gente (δμ.)	14
29. 21. 5 quod suum non esset (δμ.)	16
29. 35. 14 deuexam equitatus (δμ.)	16
29. 1. 10 atque exercendorum (δμ.)	17
27. 7. 9 praeuissit urbanus (δμ.)	18
27. 12. 2 non iter quietos facere (δμ.)	20
28. 23. 1 iure belli in armatos re	20
30. 4. 6 hasdrubal ab syphace ab (δμ.)	20
30. 12. 18 institit deinde reputa	20
28. 11. 8 metu . . . minime (δμ.)	25
29. 33. 9 garamantum omne tempus usque (δμ.)	25
29. 1. 11 multisque proeliis rem publicam	28
30. 17. 9 donis . . . dedisse (δμ.)	35
(18+17)	
26. 51. 8 nunc . . . decurrebat (double δμ.)	54
(3×18)	
29. 26. 8 nauigantibus . . . silentio (δμ.)	54
(3×18)	
29. 12. 9 retinenda . . . Hispania (δμ.)	63
(3×21)	

and in 24. 32. 9 *postero die servi ad* (17) are omitted by P but added by P¹ (i.e. P himself) in the margin; here he seems to have omitted a line but noticed it (there is no δμ.).

In 30. 33. 15 there is an omission of 17 letters, in 30. 35. 9 of 25 (which could be shortened to 21) and in 30. 37. 10 of 18, all without δμ., by CB, and evidently therefore by P (but here P is lost).

Of these, in 28. 11. 8 if *in agros*, which I suspect for other reasons, is a marginal addition, the line is reduced to 18 letters; on the contrary, in 28. 23. 1 there is an acknowledged loss of a word or words before *iure*, which may or may not have been in P's model; 29. 33. 9, P's model, may have

¹ I have discussed some of the first decade in the Preface of the forthcoming vol. 2.

gone wrong on *Garamantum* and telescoped *tempusq.* 29. 1. 11 is clearly reducible by writing *remp.* or *rēp.*

In 27. 32. 7 there is an omission and distortion:

S¹ had *omnes copias | ad propinquum Eliorum |* (19) *castellum Pyrgum uocant |* (18) *eduxit*; P has *castellum pyrgum uocant copias omnes* before *eduxit*. It would seem that P's model had *copias omnes eduxit* only, but the omitted words *castellum Pyrgum uocant* (18) in the margin. P naturally inserted them wrongly; I see no other way of explaining the phenomena.

It seems then that P's model was of much the same shape as P, but longer and not so dumpy; the shorter lines rather suggest a predecessor of the line-length of the palimpsest of the *de Rep.*; the few (if there are really any) of 25-26 letters would be two of these.

The larger omissions of P (27. 2. 11-27. 3. 7), or about 1120 (18 × 62) letters, seem to point to the loss of a page of two columns; if so, the model resembled the Veronese palimpsest (first decade) or the Vatican fragmentary palimpsest of Bk. 91, which have thirty lines of two columns to a page. The larger omission (26. 41. 18-26. 43. 9), of which S (as shown by the Supplement in *Agennensis*) has preserved two folios, or four pages,² to judge by the size of the loss of P in Bk. 27. (It would seem by the matter that there is complete loss of another folium still.)

A recognised distortion in P is 22. 10. 2. He has inserted between *Quiritium* and *quod* the words *quod duellum—Alpes sunt* (corrig. Lipsius)—i.e. exactly four lines of 18 letters; for P writes *PR* for *populo Romano* and *qui ui* for *qui*; it would seem that the words had fallen out into the margin and were reinstated in the wrong place. In 22. 18. 10 Luchs has changed *ab continuis cladibus ac respirasse* to *ac respirasse ab continuis cladibus* (as C's corrector apparently did long before); Valla's correction is less likely, if we realised that 19 letters are concerned;

¹ For S's lines see below.

² In the Medicean of 1-10 there are two distortions of the text, probably due to the displacement of quaternions in the predecessor of M; similarly in O a quaternion appears to be lost after 4. 30. 14

P, confusing *ab* and *ac*, wrote *ac respirasse*, discovered his omission, and, 'more suo,' then wrote *ab continuis cladibus* (and said nothing about it³), or P's model was responsible.

In 22. 32. §§ 1, 2, 3, P's order is §§ 3, 1, 2. Valla (in A⁴) marked the passage, and Claude du Puis (in his P) suggests a transposition; Grynaeus (ed. Frob. 1531) transposed as now accepted; there are 18 × 10 letters in §§ 1 and 2 and 18 × 20 in § 3. It looks as if part of a column got in before the other part.

In a list of dittographs which I have made in Bks. 23, 24, 25 there are ten normal lines (or multiples) repeated, one slightly exceeding, seven of 24-26, but all, I think, showing a normal line + a repeated word or words, and six of 29-31, which are abnormal, but suggest that the line is the cause of the repetition. I think they are all due to P himself, not a predecessor; but we must remember that P (and perhaps P's model) has incomplete lines, making paragraphs even where continuity of writing is required (cf. Clark, p. 46).

I must add one from 26. 29. 9: *inicum | extra sortem conlege optionem dari provinciae iniquum*, with difference of spelling (not unusual in P): 47 letters (16 + 17 + 14 actually) repeated.

But on the whole I am not inclined to set much store by these repetitions; I believe the line-principle fixes their 'terminus ad quem,' but nothing limits their 'terminus a quo'; the scribe may or may not go back to any starting-place.

The Spirensian tradition, on the other hand, has omissions: in 30. 28. 11 S omitted *pulsos se Hispania* (6μ.) or 16 letters, but P has it twice, to make up for S's deficiency; this would suggest that S and P are descended from an ancestor of like shape. In 29. 21. 6 the Turin palimpsest (classed as of the same ancestry as S) omitted originally *restitui*

³ This is P's way: he does not call unnecessary attention to his mistakes and he does not like to mess his beautiful parchment; when he repeats half a word from a line above he quietly goes on as if nothing had happened (I am not sure that the larger repetitions are not corrected by him); Vindob. seems much the same.

⁴ See *Class. Quart.* XI (1917), pp. 154 ff., 'The Codex Agennensis and Valla.'

... *Locrensiūm* (6μ.) or 59 (3 × 20) letters, and similarly in 29. 21. 5, *si quid* . . . *repeteret* (6μ.) 33, where T² gives *conpraehenderet*.

S omits in 27. 11. 12 *concedente collega* 17; in 28. 29. 4 *quid optaverint* (6μ.) 14; in 29. 37. 7 *ipsorum colonia-rum* 17.

Longer omissions by S are mentioned by Rhenanus at 27. 7. 14 and 26. 43. 6 of uncertain length, as he does not give details (he says a page, but means a folio); these are apparently due to the scribe, not to wanton destroyers; but the Munich folio of S—viz. 28. 39. 16—28. 41. 22¹ shows 4,000, more or less, letters in the folio, so if the losses are due to the scribe, the uncial MS. from which S is descended was rather smaller than P's model.

But the evidence of C, as being a direct copy of P, and of other copies of P, is instructively bearing on Professor Clark's principle of omission based on 6μ. and line or line only (or thereabouts). C omits 22. 22. 21–23. 1 *quoque*—in *Hispania* (no 6μ.), 76 (4 × 19) letters. Here P has

Romanos quoque et
..... (3 lines)
haec in Hispania quo
que

with a deleted *quoque* between *Carthaginenses* and *concedere*; in 22. 39. 21

¹ (*München. Cod. Lat.*, 23491). The late A. H. Kyd copied this remaining (if it does remain now) folio of S entirely out for me shortly before his lamented death.

C omits *metuit* . . . *agentem* (6μ.), 37 letters, which looks like 18 + 19, but actually P has | *metuit* . . . *ni* | *hil* . . . *agen* | *tem te ratio*. My second example is still more instructive: in 22. 55. 3 *clamor* . . . *mortuique* (6μ. of *que*, 58 letters—i.e. 3 × 19, but P has *clamor* | *lamentantium muli* | *erum* . . . *pa* | *lam* . . . *mor* | *tuique*, lines of 18 (ending with *clamor*), 16, 14, 15 letters). In 26. 2. 10 C omits *praesidio* . . . *essent*, 35 letters. P has *essent* in middle of second line under *esset*. We must interpret the canon rather liberally in some of these; but we are dealing with small amounts, against which Professor Clark warns us. Moreover C is copying majuscules into minuscules, and evidently read somewhat ahead in making his copy.

In 30. 38. 12–39. 1 C omits *reddita Claudium* (no 6μ.), 15 letters; in 30. 42. 17 *victis quam vincendo* (6μ.), 18; and in 30. 45. 2 *militum* . . . *per*, 26; but we have no means of knowing what P had here (Luchs' Proleg. p. lviii).

B omits *ex duobus exercitibus* (19 or 17), without 6μ., in 30. 41. 5, and the Munich fragments has dittograph in 23. 49. 2: after *periculo essent* the scribe goes back and repeats *alterum ut quae in naues* (19 or 20).²

C. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS.

² As A. H. Kyd, who sent me notice and readings of these fragments, pointed out, this was due to the *essent*, with which P ends both lines.

RECONSTRUCTION PROBLEMS, 21: THE CLASSICS IN BRITISH EDUCATION.

Reconstruction Problems, 21: The Classics in British Education. London: Published by His Majesty's Stationery Office, Imperial House, Kingsway, W.C. 2, etc., 1919. Price 2d. net.

THIS is an admirable pamphlet, temperate yet thorough, summarising in 'fourteen points' just what the keen but (sometimes) inarticulate friend of the Classics needs to know, if he is to take up his parable and give cogent reasons for the faith that is in him.

The writer takes a broad view, and he avoids 'fine writing.' Salient features are the valuable references to the Book of the Princeton Conference (with some of its most striking facts in *précis*) and to the statement on the Greek question by M. Albert Mansbridge, representing the W.E.A. The claims of Greek are convincingly put, and the importance of Latin as a 'pivotal' subject is not neglected—in particular on the linguistic side; an argument that might be clinched in one word if we agreed

to call a spade a spade and Latin (not Latin but) European, as being the one language on which all the other languages that matter in modern Europe are alike based.

The pamphlet deserves the heartiest welcome and the closest attention that

all friends of the cause can give it. If the Classics are to survive as an *effective* force in the reconstructed scheme of national education, it must be on some such lines as those advocated here: *ἐν τούτῳ νικήσουσιν*.

D. A. S.

NOTES AND NEWS

At the Annual General Meeting of the Northumberland and Durham Branch of the Classical Association, held on February 22, it was decided to invite the parent Classical Association to visit Newcastle-upon-Tyne in 1920, as it is hoped that the buildings of Armstrong College may at an early date be evacuated by the military authorities.

At the last ordinary meeting of the Branch in 1918, the Rev. Dr. Dawson Walker, Durham, read a paper on 'The Influence of the Stoic *diatribe* on the style of St. Paul's Epistles,' and at the first meeting of 1919 Dr. J. Wight Duff, Newcastle, read a paper on 'Velleius Paterculus as a representative of Silver Age prose.'

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

. *Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Andreades* (A. M.) Sir Charles Dilke and Greece. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. iv + 58. Athens: A. Raptane, 1918. Dr. 2: On Money and the buying Power of the Precious Metals in the Byzantine Empire. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. ii + 42. Athens: Tarousopoulos, 1918. [No price given.] Constantinople: its Population and Wealth in the Middle Ages. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. vi + 249—ii + 297. Athens: Sakellarios, 1918. [No price given.] The Economic System of Greece, from Heroic Times till the Establishment of the Kingdom of Greece. Vol. I., Part 2. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 7". Pp. xii + 624. Athens: A. Raptane, 1918. [No price given.]
- Beasley* (J. D.) Attic Red-Figured Vases in American Museums. 11" x 8". Pp. x + 236. Oxford University Press (for Harvard University), 1918. Half cloth, 30s. net.
- Fowler* (W. W.) The Death of Turnus: Observations on the XIIth Book of the Aeneid. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5". Pp. viii + 158. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1919. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Greece before the Conference*. By Polybius. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xxvi + 120. London: Methuen and Co., 1919. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Hermathena* (No. XLI.) 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. ix + 175—330 + iv. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co., 1919. 4s.
- Janssen* (J.) C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Domitiani (Doctor's Dissertation). 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. iv + 96. Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1919.
- Koberberg* (S.) Polybii Historiarum Liber XXX. quoad fieri potuit restitutus (Doctor's Dissertation). 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. viii + 104. Amsterdam. J. H. Kok, 1919.
- Lofberg* (J. O.) Sycophancy in Athens (Dissertation for Doctorate). 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. xii + 104. University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago, Illinois, 1917.
- Moore* (C. H.) Pagan Ideas of Immortality during the early Christian Centuries. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. viii + 64. Oxford University Press (for Harvard University). Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Murray* (G.) Aristophanes and the War Party: A Study in the Contemporary Criticism of the Peloponnesian War. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4". Pp. 48. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1919. 1s. net.
- Oxyrhynchus Papyri XIII*. Edited by Drs. Grenfell and Hunt. 8" x 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. iv + 236. Cloth.
- Sandys* (J. E.) Latin Epigraphy: an Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. xxiv + 324. Cambridge: University Press, 1919. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Thompson* (T.) and *Srawley* (J. H.) St. Ambrose 'on the Mysteries' and the treatise 'on the Sacraments.' (Christian Literature Series.) 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 144. London: S.P.C.K., 1919. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.
- Wright* (H. G.) The Life and Works of Arthur Hall of Grantham. 9" x 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. x + 233. Manchester: University Press, 1919. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

If
we
of
he
év

he
on
he
he
he
ff,
us
ver

for

shed

am-

Dis-
Pp.
ries,

ality
ries.
rsity
loth,

War
riti-
x 4".
win,

Drs.
236.

ntro-
ions.
Uni-

Am-
atise
ature
don :

s of
Pp.
ress,